

LOCAL STRUCTURE OF TAME SYMMETRIC ALGEBRAS OF PERIOD FOUR*

KARIN ERDMANN, ADAM HAJDUK, AND ADAM SKOWYRSKI

ABSTRACT. In this paper we study the structure of Gabriel quivers of tame symmetric algebras of period four. More precisely, we focus on algebras having Gabriel quiver *biregular*, i.e. the numbers of arrows starting and ending at any vertex are equal, and do not exceed 2. We describe the local structure of biregular Gabriel quivers of tame symmetric algebras of period four, including certain idempotent algebras. The main result of this paper shows that, in fact, these Gabriel quivers have local structure exactly as Gabriel quivers of so called *weighted surface algebras* (see [15, 17]), which partially extends characterization presented in [16].

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper by an algebra we mean an indecomposable basic finite-dimensional K -algebra over an algebraically closed field K . For an algebra Λ , we denote by $\text{mod } \Lambda$ the category of all finitely generated (right) Λ -modules.

From the remarkable Tame and Wild Theorem [7] (see also [4]) every algebra lies in one of two disjoint classes. The first class consists of so called *tame algebras* for which the indecomposable modules occur in each dimension d in a finite number of discrete and a finite number of one-parameter families. The second class contains the *wild algebras* whose representation theory comprises the representation theories of all algebras.

A prominent role in the representation theory is played by the *selfinjective* algebras, which are algebras Λ such that Λ is injective in $\text{mod } \Lambda$, or equivalently, every projective module in $\text{mod } \Lambda$ is injective. Among the selfinjective algebras we distinguish two important classes: symmetric algebras and periodic algebras.

Recall that an algebra Λ is said to be symmetric if there exists an associative non-degenerate symmetric K -bilinear form on Λ , and any such an algebra is selfinjective, due to well known characterizations; see [32]. There are many classical examples of symmetric algebras, for instance, blocks of finite-dimensional group algebras [12] or Hecke algebras associated to Coxeter groups. Any algebra Λ is a quotient of its trivial extension $T(\Lambda)$, which is a symmetric algebra. For a module M in $\text{mod } \Lambda$, we denote by $\Omega_\Lambda(M)$ its syzygy, that is the kernel of a minimal projective cover of M in $\text{mod } \Lambda$. A module M in $\text{mod } \Lambda$ is called *periodic* if $\Omega_\Lambda^n(M) \simeq M$, for some $n \geq 1$, and the minimal such a number is called the *period* of M . An important class of selfinjective algebras consists of the *periodic* algebras Λ , for which Λ is a periodic module in $\text{mod } \Lambda^e$, where $\Lambda^e = \Lambda \otimes_K \Lambda$ is the enveloping algebra of Λ (this is equivalent to say that Λ is periodic as an Λ - Λ -bimodule). Every periodic algebra Λ has periodic module category, that is, all (nonprojective) modules in $\text{mod } \Lambda$ are periodic (with period dividing the period of Λ [32, see Theorem IV.11.19]). Finding and possibly classifying periodic algebras is an important problem,

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 16D50, 16E30, 16G20, 16G60.

Key words and phrases. Symmetric algebra, tame algebra, periodic algebra, quiver.

*THIS ARTICLE WAS PARTIALLY FINANCED FROM THE RESEARCH GRANT NO. 2023/51/D/ST1/01214 OF THE POLISH NATIONAL SCIENCE CENTER

as they appear in many places, revealing connections with group theory, topology, singularity theory, cluster algebras and algebraic combinatorics (see the survey [20]).

We only mention that any periodic algebra Λ is selfinjective, due to the results of [24]. Indeed, if Λ is d -periodic, then any simple Λ -module is Ω_Λ -periodic with period dividing d . This is equivalent to say that Λ is so-called *d -twisted periodic* algebra, which means that $\Omega_{\Lambda^e}^d(\Lambda) \cong {}_1\Lambda_\sigma$, in $\text{mod } \Lambda^e$, for some automorphism σ of Λ . Both these conditions imply that Λ is selfinjective, by [24, Theorem 1.4]. The inverse question, whether any d -twisted periodic algebra is also periodic is a longstanding conjecture (see [21]).

We are concerned with the classification of all tame symmetric periodic algebras, with a special focus on the case of 4-periodic algebras, which is motivated by a conjecture that all tame symmetric periodic algebras of non-polynomial growth are of period 4 [15, Problem]. Any tame symmetric periodic algebra will be called TSP4, for short. Such algebras appeared naturally in the study of blocks of group algebras with generalized quaternion defect groups. Using known properties of these blocks, Erdmann introduced and investigated in [9, 10, 11, 12] the algebras of quaternion type, as the (indecomposable) representation-infinite tame symmetric algebras with non-singular Cartan matrix for which every indecomposable non-projective module is periodic of period dividing 4. The most recent extension concerns so-called *generalized quaternion algebras* [16], or simply GQT algebras, which are by definition, the (indecomposable) tame symmetric algebras of infinite representation type with all simple modules of period (exactly) 4. Note that any representation-infinite algebra of quaternion type, or more generally, TSP4 algebra, is a GQT algebra (see [13]).

In [8] Dugas proved that every representation-finite self-injective algebra, without simple blocks, is a periodic algebra. We note that the symmetric periodic algebras of finite representation type and representation-infinite of polynomial growth are classified, and each class admits a similar description as a socle deformation of an algebra of invariants of the trivial extension algebra of a tilted algebra (of Dynkin or tubular type; see [3, 29]).


Recently, motivated by cluster theory, Erdmann and Skowroński defined large class of symmetric periodic algebras of period 4 associated to triangulations of real compact surfaces, called *weighted surface algebras* (see [15, 17, 23]). These are algebras of the form $\Lambda = \Lambda(S, \vec{\mathcal{T}}, m_\bullet, c_\bullet, b_\bullet)$ associated to a (directed) triangulated surface $(S, \vec{\mathcal{T}})$ and some additional data encoded in functions m_\bullet , c_\bullet , and b_\bullet . More specifically, starting from $(S, \vec{\mathcal{T}})$ they first construct a so-called triangulation quiver (Q, f) uniquely determined by $(S, \vec{\mathcal{T}})$, where Q is a 2-regular quiver and f is a certain permutation of arrows in Q (of order 3), and then define Λ as a quotient $\Lambda = KQ/I$ of the path algebra KQ of Q by an ideal I depending on $(Q, f, m_\bullet, c_\bullet, b_\bullet)$. Recall that a vertex in Q is p -regular if there are exactly p arrows starting and p arrows ending at this vertex, and Q is called p -regular, provided that all of its vertices are p -regular. Note also that the quiver Q is a glueing of a finite number of the following three types of *blocks*

$$I: \textcirclearrowleft \circ \quad II: \textcirclearrowleft \bullet \rightleftarrows \circ \quad III: \begin{array}{c} \circ \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \circ \longrightarrow \circ \end{array}$$


corresponding to boundary edges, self-folded triangles, and triangles of the triangulation $\vec{\mathcal{T}}$, respectively (for a definition of a block, see the end of Section 2).

By the results of [15, 17], the weighted triangulation algebras are TSP4 algebras, with some minor exceptions. Actually, they exhaust all TSP4 algebras in some cases, as due to the results of Erdmann and Skowroński from [16], an algebra Λ with 2-regular Gabriel quiver having at least three vertices is a TSP4 algebra (if and only if Λ is a GQT algebra) if and only if Λ is a

weighted surface algebra $\Lambda(S, \vec{\mathcal{T}}, m_{\bullet}, c_{\bullet}, b_{\bullet})$ different from a singular tetrahedral algebra, or else it is the higher tetrahedral algebra $\Lambda(m, \lambda)$, $m \geq 2$, $\lambda \in K^*$. For details we refer to [16]; see also [18]. Note that the Gabriel quiver Q_{Λ} of a weighted surface algebra $\Lambda = KQ/I$ is not necessarily 2-regular, and this is the case if and only if $Q_{\Lambda} = Q$. In general, Q_{Λ} may be smaller than Q , and the arrows in Q which are not visible in Q_{Λ} , are called virtual. Nonetheless, the Gabriel quiver of any weighted surface algebra is *biregular*, that is, any vertex of Q is either 1-regular or 2-regular. Indeed, any virtual arrow in Q is either a loop in a block of type II, or it forms a 2-cycle coming from glueing of two blocks of type III. As a result, if α is a virtual arrow in Q , then Q admits one of the following two subquivers




where in the second case α is one of the two arrows forming a 2-cycle. Consequently, then the Gabriel quiver Q_{Λ} contains one of the following blocks



where the black vertices are 1-regular in Q_{Λ} . Using the previous blocks I-III together with V1 and V2, we can construct all Gabriel quivers of weighted surface algebras, including the quiver of a spherical algebra [27, see Section 5], which is obtained by a glueing of two blocks V2. There is a nice analogy between the biregular case and 2-regular case, since we also have an exceptional algebra, called higher spherical algebra [19], which is a TSP4 algebra given by the same Gabriel quiver as the spherical algebra (biregular), but it is not isomorphic to a weighted surface algebra. This suggest that the first natural step after [16] is to classify all TSP4 (or GQT) algebras having biregular Gabriel quivers, and prove that these are either weighted surface algebras (except singular spherical algebras) or higher spherical algebras.

In this paper, we focus on describing the local structure of Gabriel quivers of TSP4 algebras, which is already a challenge. Our main result shows that indeed, if Λ is a GQT algebra with biregular Gabriel quiver, then all 1-regular vertices belong to blocks of types V1 or V2. Namely, we have the following theorem, which states the main result of this article.

Main Theorem. *Let Λ be a GQT algebra with biregular Gabriel quiver $Q = Q_{\Lambda}$. Then every 1-regular vertex i in Q is contained in a block of the form*



The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we recall basic notions needed in this article. Section 3 summarizes the most important results from [14] on tame symmetric algebras of period four used further. In Section 4 we discuss some preparatory results concerning 1-regular vertices. Section 5 presents one crucial proposition describing the local structure of Gabriel quiver around 1-vertices lying in triangles, which is the most demanding result of this paper. In the last section we give a proof of the Main Theorem.

For the necessary background in the representation theory of algebras we refer the reader to books [1, 32].

2. BASIC NOTIONS

By a quiver we mean a quadruple $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, s, t)$, where Q_0 is a finite set of vertices, Q_1 a finite set of arrows and $s, t : Q_1 \rightarrow Q_0$ are functions assigning to every arrow α its source $s(\alpha)$ and its target $t(\alpha)$. For a quiver Q , we denote by KQ the *path algebra* of Q , whose K -basis is given by all paths of length ≥ 0 in Q . Recall that the Jacobson radical of KQ is the ideal R_Q of Q generated by all paths of length ≥ 1 , and ideal I of KQ is called *admissible*, provided that $R_Q^m \subseteq I \subseteq R_Q^2$, for some $m \geq 2$. Note that the trivial paths ε_i (of length 0) at vertices $i \in Q_0$ form a complete set of pairwise orthogonal primitive idempotents of the path algebra KQ , and their sum is the unit of KQ .

If Q is a quiver and I is an admissible ideal I of KQ , then (Q, I) is said to be a *bound quiver*, and the associated algebra KQ/I is called a *bound quiver algebra*. It is well-known that any algebra over an algebraically closed field is Morita equivalent to a bound quiver algebra, and by a presentation of an algebra Λ we mean a particular isomorphism $\Lambda \cong KQ/I$, for some bound quiver (Q, I) . In this case, the cosets $e_i = \varepsilon_i + I \in \Lambda$ form a complete set of primitive idempotents of Λ and $\sum_{i \in Q_0} e_i$ is the unit of Λ .

A *relation* in the path algebra KQ is any K -linear combination of the form

$$(1) \quad \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i w_i,$$

where all $\lambda_i \in K$ are non-zero and the w_i are pairwise different paths of length ≥ 2 with common source and target. It is known that an ideal I of KQ is admissible if and only if I is generated by a finite number of relations ρ_1, \dots, ρ_m . Moreover, we may choose such relations ρ_1, \dots, ρ_m to be minimal (i.e. each ρ_i is not a combination of relations from I). For a bound quiver algebra $A = KQ/I$, given the set of (minimal) relations ρ_1, \dots, ρ_m generating I , we have the (minimal) equalities $\rho_1 = 0, \dots, \rho_m = 0$, called *minimal relations*.

Let ρ be a relation of the form (1) and w a path in Q . We write $w \prec \rho$, if w is one of the summands of ρ , i.e. $w = w_i$, for some $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Moreover, if w is a path in Q , we will use notation $w \prec I$, if $w \prec \rho_i$, for some $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, where ρ_1, \dots, ρ_m are fixed minimal relations generating I .

If Λ is an algebra with a given presentation $\Lambda = KQ/I$, the modules $P_i = e_i \Lambda$, for $i \in Q_0$, form a complete set of all pairwise non-isomorphic indecomposable projective modules in $\text{mod } \Lambda$, and modules the $I_i = D(\Lambda e_i)$, for $i \in Q_0$, form a complete set of all pairwise non-isomorphic indecomposable injective modules in $\text{mod } \Lambda$. We denote by S_i , $i \in Q_0$, the associated simple module $S_i = P_i / \text{rad } P_i \cong \text{soc } I_i$.

In this paper we work with algebras Λ which are symmetric, that is, there is a non-degenerate (associative) symmetric K -bilinear form $\Lambda \times \Lambda \rightarrow K$. It follows that $P_i \simeq I_i$, for any $i \in Q_0$, hence in particular, Λ is then a self-injective algebra. We also assume Q is connected, i.e. Λ is indecomposable as an algebra. For a vertex $i \in Q$, we denote by p_i the dimension vector of P_i , and by s_i the dimension vector of S_i . Let also J denote the Jacobson radical $J = J_\Lambda = R_Q + I$ of Λ .

For $i \in Q_0$, we let i^- be the set of arrows ending at i , and i^+ the set of arrows starting at i . In this paper, the sizes $|i^-|$ and $|i^+|$ are at most 2. A quiver Q is said to be *2-regular* if $|i^-| = |i^+| = 2$, and *biserial* if $1 \leq |i^-|, |i^+| \leq 2$. We say that $i \in Q_0$ is a *regular vertex* (1- or

2-regular), provided $|i^-| = |i^+|$ (and the size is equal 1 or 2, respectively). Otherwise, we call i a *non-regular* vertex. In other words, Q is biserial and regular if and only if Q_0 consists only of 1- or 2-regular vertices. In this case, we will call Q a *biregular* quiver, for short.

All algebras considered in this article are assumed to be tame. Let us point out a few consequences of this assumption. First, for any two vertices $i, j \in Q_0$, there are at most two arrows $i \rightarrow j$ in Q_1 , since otherwise, Q has a Kronecker subquiver Δ with three arrows, and the path algebra $K\Delta$ is a wild hereditary quotient algebra of Λ , and Λ is a wild algebra.

Further, it is clear that Q cannot have a subquiver Δ of the form

$$K_2^+ = \circ \xleftarrow{\quad} \circ \rightarrow \circ \quad \text{or} \quad K_2^- = \circ \xrightarrow{\quad} \circ \leftarrow \circ$$

because $K\Delta$ would be again a wild (hereditary) quotient algebra of Λ . It follows that for any two vertices i, j connected by double arrows $\alpha, \bar{\alpha}$, there are no loops at i, j . Indeed, if there is a loop at i or j then there exists a quotient algebra C of $B = \Lambda/J^3$ and a Galois covering $\tilde{C} \rightarrow C$ such that \tilde{C} contains a full convex subcategory of one of the forms

$$\circ \xleftarrow[\alpha]{\bar{\alpha}} \circ \rightarrow \circ \quad \text{or} \quad \circ \xrightarrow[\alpha]{\bar{\alpha}} \circ \leftarrow \circ$$

which is isomorphic to a wild hereditary algebra $K\Delta$, where Δ is of type K_2^\pm . Then using [6, Theorem] and [5, Proposition 2] we conclude that \tilde{C} and C are wild. Since C is a quotient of B and Λ , we obtain that Λ is wild.

Using analogous argumentation, one can prove that for any vertex $i \in Q_0$, there is at most one loop at i , if Q has more than one vertex. In fact, if Q admits two loops at vertex i , then appropriate Galois covering contains an infinite double-line

$$\dots \xrightarrow{\quad} \circ \xrightarrow{\quad} \circ \xrightarrow{\quad} \dots$$

being a 'resolution' of the two loops in Q . It follows that Q has exactly one vertex, because otherwise, the above line can be extended to a wild subcategory of type K_2^\pm .

We say that Δ is a subquiver of type K_2^* if Δ is one of the following two quivers

$$\circ \xrightarrow[\alpha]{\bar{\alpha}} \circ \rightarrow \circ \quad \text{or} \quad \circ \rightarrow \circ \xrightarrow[\alpha]{\bar{\alpha}} \circ$$

and both $\alpha\beta, \bar{\alpha}\beta \notin I$ (or both $\beta\alpha, \beta\bar{\alpha} \notin I$). Note that if Λ is tame, its Gabriel quiver $Q = Q_\Lambda$ does not contain a subquiver of type K_2^* . To see this, let Δ be a subquiver in Q of type K_2^* . Then consider the factor algebra $C = KQ/J_C$ of $B = \Lambda/J^3$, where J_C is generated by all paths of length 2 in Q except $\alpha\beta$ and $\bar{\alpha}\beta$, in the first case, and $\beta\alpha, \beta\bar{\alpha}$, in the second. As before, C admits a Galois covering $\tilde{C} \rightarrow C$ containing a full convex subcategory

$$\circ \xrightarrow[\alpha]{\bar{\alpha}} \circ \rightarrow \circ \quad \text{or} \quad \circ \rightarrow \circ \xrightarrow[\alpha]{\bar{\alpha}} \circ$$

which is isomorphic to a wild hereditary algebra $K\Delta$.

The above subquivers can be viewed as the smallest wild 'pieces' that may occur in Q . In this paper we will frequently use also other wild subquivers, or more precisely, induced bound quivers (or algebras), which are referred to as the *wild one-relation algebras*. They were introduced by Ringel in [28], where the list of all 37 wild-one relation algebras was also presented [28, see 1.5. Theorem 2]. Actually, the list contains only underlying graphs (with unique relation marked by circle and square), and whenever we use the term wild one-relation algebra, we mean an algebra such that its Gabriel quiver has underlying graph being one of the shapes listed in [28]. We omit marking the unique relation, because it is always clear from the context what is its position.


We will use abbreviation RiN to indicate the wild one-relation algebra, whose number on the Ringel's list is N . Note that the list in [28] uses three sorts of numerations to denote the graphs, and by a number on this list, we mean its number in the Roman numeration (one of the three conventions). For hereditary algebras of Euclidean (or wild) type, we use classical notation $\tilde{A}_n, \tilde{D}_n, \tilde{E}_6, \tilde{E}_7, \tilde{E}_8$ (or $\tilde{\tilde{D}}_n, \tilde{\tilde{E}}_6, \tilde{\tilde{E}}_7, \tilde{\tilde{E}}_8$). The biggest usage of this notation will be visible in two crucial results of this paper, that is, the Main Theorem and Proposition 5.1.

Now, let us only mention one simplification which is equally frequently used during the sequel, where many proofs contain wordings like "the algebra admits the following wild-one relation algebra ... in covering". By this we mean a precise statement in the language of covering theory, namely, an algebra A is said to be a subcategory in covering of Λ , provided that the algebra $B = \Lambda/J^d$ (for some $d \geq 3$) has a quotient algebra C , which admits a Galois covering $\tilde{C} \rightarrow \tilde{C}/G = C$, with finitely generated free group G , such that \tilde{C} contains a full subcategory isomorphic to A .

Anytime we use this abbreviation, appropriate arguments can be verified, but we do not elaborate on this, to avoid making longer enough long proofs. One simple instance of an argumentation of this type was shown above in the case of subquivers of type K_2^* , where the essential results needed from covering theory are cited. For more background on covering techniques we refer to cited papers [5, 6].

We will use the following notation and convention for arrows: we write $\alpha, \bar{\alpha}$ for the arrows starting at vertex i , with the convention that $\bar{\alpha}$ does not exist in case $|i^+| = 1$. Similarly we write γ, γ^* for the arrows ending at some vertex i , where again γ^* may not exist.

Then Q has a subquiver



We note that for a module M in $\text{mod } \Lambda$, its *syzygy* $\Omega(M)$ is a kernel of any projective cover of M in $\text{mod } \Lambda$. A module M in $\text{mod } \Lambda$ is called *periodic* if $\Omega^d(M) \simeq M$, for some $n \geq 1$, and the smallest such a number is *period* of M . The notion of *inverse syzygy* $\Omega^{-1}(M)$ for a module M in $\text{mod } \Lambda$ is defined similarly using injective envelopes.

Let $i \in Q_0$. Recall that there are canonical isomorphisms $\Omega(S_i) = \text{rad } P_i = \alpha\Lambda + \bar{\alpha}\Lambda$ and $\Omega^{-1}(S_i) \cong (\gamma, \gamma^*)\Lambda \subset P_x \oplus P_y$ [16, see Lemma 4.1]. In particular, then the module $P_i^+ = P_j \oplus P_k$ is a projective cover of $\Omega(S_i)$ and the module $P_i^- = P_x \oplus P_y$ is an injective envelope of $\Omega^{-1}(S_i)$ (Λ is symmetric). As a result, if S_i is a periodic module of period 4, then $\Omega^2(S_i) \simeq \Omega^{-2}(S_i)$, and hence there is an exact sequence in $\text{mod } \Lambda$ of the form

$$(*) \quad 0 \rightarrow S_i \rightarrow P_i \xrightarrow{d_3} P_i^- \xrightarrow{d_2} P_i^+ \xrightarrow{d_1} P_i \rightarrow S_i \rightarrow 0$$

with $\text{Im } d_k \simeq \Omega^k(S_i)$, for $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. By our convention, P_y or P_k may not exist. Moreover, we denote by p_i^+ (respectively, p_i^-) the dimension vector of P_i^+ (respectively, of P_i^-). Using the above sequence, one easily gets that $p_i^+ = p_i^-$. This dimension vector will be denoted by \hat{p}_i (see also Lemma 3.1).

We may assume that $d_1(x, y) := \alpha x + \bar{\alpha} y$, since the induced epimorphism $(\alpha \ \bar{\alpha}) : P_j \oplus P_k \rightarrow \Omega(S_i) = \alpha\Lambda + \bar{\alpha}\Lambda$ is a projective cover of $\Omega(S_i)$ in $\text{mod } \Lambda$. Adjusting arrows γ or γ^* (including impact on generators of I), we can fix $d_3(e_i) = (\gamma, \gamma^*)$, for some choice of the arrows γ, γ^* ending at i [16, see Proposition 4.3].

The kernel of d_1 is then $\Omega^2(S_i) = \text{Im } d_2$, and it has at most two minimal generators. They are images of idempotents $e_x \in P_x = e_x \Lambda$ and $e_y \in P_y$ via $d_2 : P_i^- \rightarrow P_i^+$. We denote them as φ and ψ , respectively, and then $\varphi, \psi \in P_j \oplus P_k$, so we can write

$$\varphi = d_2(e_x, 0) = (\varphi_{jx}, \varphi_{kx}) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi = d_2(0, e_y) = (\psi_{jy}, \psi_{ky}),$$

where φ_{ab} and ψ_{ab} belong to $e_a \Lambda e_b$ for all components of φ and ψ .

We recall that any homomorphism $d : P_x \oplus P_y \rightarrow P_j \oplus P_k$ in $\text{mod } \Lambda$ can be represented in the matrix form

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} m_{jx} & m_{jy} \\ m_{kx} & m_{ky} \end{pmatrix},$$

where m_{ab} is a homomorphism $P_b \rightarrow P_a$ in $\text{mod } \Lambda$, identified with an element $m_{ab} \in e_a \Lambda e_b$. In this way, d becomes multiplication by M , i.e. $d(u) = M \cdot u$, for any $u \in P_i^-$ (here we use column notation for vectors in P_i^- and P_i^+).

Continuing with the generators of $\Omega^2(S_i)$, let M_i be the matrix with columns being the components of φ and ψ , that is d_2 is given by matrix

$$M_i = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_{jx} & \psi_{jy} \\ \varphi_{kx} & \psi_{ky} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Rewriting compositions $d_1 d_2 = 0$ and $d_2 d_3 = 0$ in matrix form, we get identities

$$(\alpha \ \bar{\alpha}) \cdot M_i = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad M_i \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \gamma \\ \gamma^* \end{pmatrix} = 0,$$

for some choice of arrows γ, γ^* ending at i (cf. [16, Proposition 4.3]).

We end this section with an auxiliary definition of a *block*, which appears in a natural way in the study of TSP4 algebras (see Introduction). Namely, by a *block*, we mean a subquiver $\Gamma = (\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1)$ of the Gabriel quiver $Q = Q_\Lambda$, whose vertex set Γ_0 is a disjoint union $\Gamma_0 = B \cup W$, such that every arrow $\alpha : i \rightarrow j$ with $i \in B$ or $j \in B$ belongs to Γ_1 . Vertices in B are usually marked by \bullet (and called *black*), while vertices in W are marked by \circ (and called *white*, or *outlets*).

By definition, if Γ is a block in Q with $\Gamma_0 = B \cup W$, then Q consists of arrows in Γ_1 , and all other arrows, which either connect two vertices in $Q_0 \setminus \Gamma_0$, or a vertex not in Γ_0 with an outlet in W . In this way, Q can be viewed as a glueing of Γ with the rest part of the quiver via outlets in W . For a precise definition of a glueing, we refer to [31, Section 3].

3. TAME SYMMETRIC PERIODIC ALGEBRAS

This section is devoted to present the main results on tame symmetric algebras of period four needed in further investigations. In what follows, we collect the most important results from [14].

We start with two observations concerning infinite type [14, see Lemmas 2.1 and 2.4]. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{N}^n$, we denote by $|x|$ the sum $x_1 + \cdots + x_n$ of its coordinates.

Lemma 3.1. *If Λ is of infinite type, then $|\hat{p}_i| > |p_i|$, for any vertex $i \in Q_0$.*


Lemma 3.2. *If Λ is of infinite type, then there is no arrow $\alpha : i \rightarrow j$ with $i^+ = \{\alpha\} = j^-$.*

The following result gives a useful tool for constructing triangles in Q induced from relations defining $\Lambda = KQ/I$ [14, see Proposition 4.1].

Lemma 3.3. *Assume $\alpha : i \rightarrow j$ and $\beta : j \rightarrow k$ are arrows such that $\alpha\beta \prec I$. Then there is an arrow in Q from k to i , so that α and β are part of a triangle in Q .*

The following result (sometimes called the *Triangle Lemma* [14, Lemma 4.3]) shows how relations propagate through triangles in Q .


Lemma 3.4. *Assume Q contains a triangle*



with $\alpha\beta \prec I$. If γ is the unique arrow $x \rightarrow i$, then $\gamma\alpha \prec I$ and $\beta\gamma \prec I$. If we have double arrows $\gamma, \bar{\gamma} : x \rightarrow i$, then there is a $\delta \in \{\gamma, \bar{\gamma}\}$ such that $\delta\alpha \prec I$ and $\beta\delta \prec I$.

We have also the following result on the neighbours of 1-vertices [14, see Lemma 4.4].

Lemma 3.5. *Assume i is a 1-vertex which is part of a triangle*



Then both x and j must be 2-vertices.

In fact, the above result does not depend on the assumptions on Q . Namely, for arbitrary Q , the same arguments may be adapted to show that for a 1-vertex i , its neighbours satisfy $|x^-| \geq 2$ and $|j^+| \geq 2$. Combining this with Lemma 3.2, we could conclude that in infinite type, neighbours of a 1-vertex are at least 2-vertices.


Finally, the last two results [14, see Propositions 4.5 and 4.6] describe the properties of paths of length 3 involved in minimal relations.

Lemma 3.6. *Consider a path*

$$i \xrightarrow{\alpha} k \xrightarrow{\beta} t \xrightarrow{\gamma} j$$

such that $\alpha\beta \not\prec I$ and α is the unique arrow $i \rightarrow k$. If $\alpha\beta\gamma \prec I$, then there is an arrow $j \rightarrow i$.

Lemma 3.7. *Assume Q contains a square*



with $\alpha\beta\gamma \prec I$ but $\beta\gamma \not\prec I$. If δ is the unique arrow $j \rightarrow i$, then $\beta\gamma\delta \prec I$.

4. PREPARATORY RESULTS

In this paragraph we will prove a few technical results on the local structure of the Gabriel quiver near 1-regular vertices.


Assume Λ is a TSP4 algebra of infinite representation type with given presentation $\Lambda = KQ/I$ such that Q is biregular. Due to results of [16], we may assume that Q admits at least one 1-vertex, so that Q has a subquiver

$$x \xrightarrow{\gamma} i \xrightarrow{\alpha} j$$

and i is a 1-vertex. Then from the exact sequence $(*)$ for S_i we know that $p_x = p_j$. As well Λ is symmetric, therefore the Cartan matrix of Λ has a submatrix (corresponding to vertices i, j, x)

$$(\dagger) \quad \begin{pmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & a_1 \\ a_1 & a_2 & a_2 \\ a_1 & a_2 & a_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Lemma 4.1. *The quiver Q does not contain a subquiver*



with both i and i^* being 1-regular.

Proof. Suppose that Q admits a subquiver of the above form. Using $p_{\bullet}^- = p_{\bullet}^+$ for vertices i, i^* and j , we obtain $p_x = p_j = p_y$ and $p_i + p_{i^*} = p_x + p_y = 2p_j$. We denote by p the dimension vector $p := p_j = p_x = p_y$.

Now, observe that there is a commutative diagram in $\text{mod } A$ with exact rows of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & S_j & \longrightarrow & P_j & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \alpha^* \end{bmatrix}} & (\alpha, \alpha^*)\Lambda \cong \Omega_j^{-1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow v & & \downarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \Omega_i^2 \oplus \Omega_{i^*}^2 & \longrightarrow & P_j \oplus P_j & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha^* \end{bmatrix}} & \alpha\Lambda \oplus \alpha^*\Lambda = \Omega_i \oplus \Omega_{i^*} & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

where Ω_a^k denotes the k -th syzygy $\Omega^k(S_a)$. Clearly, v is a monomorphism, but not an isomorphism, so its cokernel C must be nonzero. On the other hand, using syzygies of S_i and S_{i^*} , we easily get the following equalities of dimension vectors:

$$[\Omega_i^2] = p_j - [\Omega_i] = p - p_i + s_i \quad \text{and} \quad [\Omega_{i^*}^2] = p_j - [\Omega_{i^*}] = p - p_{i^*} + s_{i^*}.$$

By $[X]$ we denote the dimension vector of a module X . Therefore, using $2p = p_i + p_{i^*}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} [C] &= [\Omega_i^2] + [\Omega_{i^*}^2] - s_j = p - p_i + s_i + p - p_{i^*} + s_{i^*} - s_j = \\ &= 2p - (p_i + p_{i^*}) + s_i + s_{i^*} - s_j = s_i + s_{i^*} - s_j, \end{aligned}$$

and we obtain a contradiction, since then $[C]$ has the j -th coordinate negative. \square

Lemma 4.2. *There is no tame symmetric algebra $A = KQ/I$ with $Q = x \rightleftarrows j$ and C_A of the form $C_A = \begin{bmatrix} a & a \\ a & a \end{bmatrix}$.*

Proof. Suppose there is an algebra A satisfying the above properties. Let γ denote the unique arrow $x \rightarrow j$, and $\beta, \bar{\beta}$, the double arrows $j \rightarrow x$.


Resolving the double arrows in covering, we get the infinite line with of the form

$$\dots \xrightarrow{\beta} x \xleftarrow{\bar{\beta}} j \xrightarrow{\beta} x \xleftarrow{\bar{\beta}} \dots$$

Therefore, since A is tame, we must have a relation of the form $\gamma(c_1\beta + c_2\bar{\beta})$ modulo radical cube. We may replace one of the arrows, and assume that $\gamma\bar{\beta} \in J^3$.


Now, the module $e_x A$ has a basis consisting of monomials starting with γ , where γ and β alternate. As a result, $e_x A e_x$ has a basis of the form $\{(\gamma\beta)^k; 0 \leq k \leq m\}$, for some $m \geq 1$ such that $(\gamma\beta)^m$ is in the socle of A . But then $e_x A e_j$ has a basis consisting of paths $(\gamma\beta)^k \gamma$, for $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, so $a_{11} = \dim_K e_x A e_x > \dim_K e_x A e_j = a_{12}$, and the Cartan matrix does not have a required form. \square

Corollary 4.3. *There is no GQT algebra $\Lambda = KQ/I$, whose Gabriel quiver $Q = Q_\Lambda$ has the form:*



with $\gamma\alpha \prec I$.

Proof. Suppose Λ is an GQT algebra with the above quiver. First, observe that $\beta^*\gamma \notin I$, by Lemma 3.3, because we have no arrows $i \rightarrow a$. It follows that $\beta^*\bar{\gamma} \prec I$, since otherwise, we would get the following wild subcategory in the covering



Using the Triangle Lemma 3.4, we infer that also $\bar{\gamma}\sigma \prec I$, since we have a triangle $(\beta^* \bar{\gamma} \sigma)$.

Now, consider the minimal relation involving $\gamma\alpha$. After possibly adjusting α and γ , we may assume that $\gamma\alpha = \bar{\gamma}z\alpha^*$, for some $z \in \Lambda$. Consequently, any path from x factorizes through $\bar{\gamma}$, and hence, $\bar{\gamma}\sigma$ is involved in a minimal relation of the form

$$\bar{\gamma}\sigma = \gamma\alpha z_1 + \bar{\gamma}z_2 = \bar{\gamma}(z\alpha^* z_1 + z_2),$$


so changing presentation $\sigma := \sigma - z\alpha^* z_1 + z_2$, we can assume $\bar{\gamma}\sigma = 0$.

Finally, consider the idempotent algebra $A = (e_x + e_j)\Lambda(e_x + e_j)$. Its Gabriel quiver contains arrow $\beta : j \rightarrow x$ induced from Q . Moreover, $\bar{\beta}\beta^* \notin I$, due to Lemma 3.3, since there are no arrows $x \rightarrow j$ in Q . Hence, there is another arrow $\tilde{\beta} : j \rightarrow x$ in Q_A , which is induced from the path $\bar{\beta}\beta^*$. The algebra A is symmetric, so we must have at least one arrow $x \rightarrow j$, and by

Lemma 4.2, we cannot have only one arrow $x \rightarrow j$, because i is 1-regular, so $p_x = p_j$, and hence C_A has equal columns. As a result, we have two arrows $x \rightarrow j$, which can be identified with paths u, v in Q . Both of these paths start with x , so they are of the form $u = \bar{\gamma}u'$ and $v = \bar{\gamma}v'$, for some $u', v' \in \Lambda$. But $\bar{\gamma}\sigma = 0$, so both u' and v' must start with α^* , and consequently, we obtain that $u = \bar{\gamma}\alpha^*u''$ and $v = \bar{\gamma}\alpha^*v''$, for $u'', v'' \in e_j\Lambda e_j = e_jAe_j$. Because u, v represent arrows in Q_A and $\bar{\gamma}\alpha^* \in J_A$, we conclude that u'' and v'' does not belong to J_A , so they are identified with units in K . It follows that $\lambda u + \mu v = 0$, for some $\lambda, \mu \in K$, which is impossible, since u, v are independent arrows in J_A/J_A^2 . \square

Let us finish this section with the following observation.

Lemma 4.4. *Q does not contain a subquiver of the form:*



where i is a 1-vertex and $\gamma\alpha \prec I$.

Proof. First, by Lemma 3.3, we may choose one arrow, say β , with $\alpha\beta, \beta\gamma \prec I$. Actually, using the exact sequence for S_i (and adjusting β if necessary), we may assume that $\alpha\beta = 0 = \beta\gamma$; see also part (1a) in the proof of 5.1. In particular, it follows that $\bar{\beta}\gamma \notin I$, since otherwise, we get $\bar{\beta}\gamma = u\bar{\beta}\gamma = \dots = 0$, and then we have an arrow $\gamma : x \rightarrow i$ in $\text{soc}(\Lambda)$.

Further, because Λ is a tame algebra, one of $\beta\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\beta}\bar{\gamma}$ is involved in a minimal relation. Hence we conclude from 3.3 that also $\bar{\gamma}\alpha^* \prec I$. We may write (possibly adjusting α^*):

$$\bar{\gamma}\alpha^* = \gamma\alpha z_1,$$

for some $z_1 \in \Lambda$, since i is a 1-vertex. On the other hand, we know that $\gamma\alpha \prec I$, so we can write $\gamma\alpha = \bar{\gamma}z\alpha^*$ (see (1b) in the proof of 5.1), and hence we get

$$\bar{\gamma}\alpha^* = \bar{\gamma}z\alpha^*z_1.$$

As a result, after replacing $\alpha^* := \alpha^* - z\alpha^*z_1$, we can assume that $\bar{\gamma}\alpha^* = 0$.

There must be an arrow $\bar{\alpha}^*$ in Q different from α^* starting at a . Otherwise we would have $\bar{\gamma}J_\Lambda = \bar{\gamma}\alpha^*\Lambda = 0$ and $\bar{\gamma}$ would be in the socle and in $e_x\Lambda e_a$, which is not possible for symmetric Λ . Similarly, we have an arrow $\bar{\gamma}^* \neq \bar{\gamma}$ ending at a .

Now, consider the idempotent algebra $R = e\Lambda e$, where $e = e_i + e_x + e_j + e_a$. Then, its Gabriel quiver contains all the arrows $\gamma, \bar{\gamma}, \alpha, \alpha^*, \beta, \bar{\beta}$, and we have $\bar{\gamma}\alpha^* = 0$ in R . Moreover, these arrows exhaust all arrows in Q_R with source or target equal to i, x or j . As a result, besides these arrows, we can only have (at most one) loop at a . Since R is also tame symmetric, we can prove as above that there must be at least one arrow in Q_R starting at a which is different from α^* . As a result, there is a loop σ in Q_R at vertex a . Additionally, σ may be taken as the cycle at a in Q starting with $\bar{\alpha}^*$.

Observe also that $\bar{\gamma}\sigma \notin I_R$. Indeed, because $\bar{\gamma}\alpha^* = 0$ and $\gamma\alpha \prec I$, we conclude that if $\bar{\gamma}\sigma \prec I_R$, then it is involved in a minimal relation of the form $\bar{\gamma}\sigma = \bar{\gamma}z$, where $z \in \sigma R$. But then, by repeating substitution, we get $\bar{\gamma}\sigma = 0$, which gives an arrow $\bar{\gamma}$ in the socle of R , a contradiction.

Next, we claim that $\sigma^2 \prec I_R$. Otherwise we have the following wild subcategory in covering

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & i & & \\
 & & & & \uparrow \gamma & & \\
 & & & & x & & \\
 & & & & \downarrow \bar{\gamma} & & \\
 i & \xleftarrow{\gamma} & x & \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} & a & \xleftarrow{\sigma} & a & \xleftarrow{\sigma} & a & \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} & j & \xleftarrow{\alpha} & i
 \end{array}$$

Recall that $\gamma\alpha \prec I$ and it is involved in a minimal relation of the form $\gamma\alpha = \bar{\gamma}z\alpha^*$, for some $z \in \Lambda$. It follows that there is an induced relation $\gamma\alpha = \bar{\gamma}\omega\alpha^*$ in R , and consequently, we have $e_x Re_j = \bar{\gamma}R\alpha^*$.

Further, we will identify the basis of local algebra $R_a = e_a Re_a$. We note that there is some monomial in the arrows, say $X = \beta q$, which spans the socle of $e_j R$. Then q ends with α or α^* . It must end in α^* , because otherwise the rotation $q\beta$ would be zero. But the algebra R is symmetric, so the rotation also is non-zero in the socle. Hence $q = q'\alpha^*$ and $X = \beta q'\alpha^*$.

Clearly q' starts with $\bar{\gamma}$, since $\beta\gamma = 0$, and then $X = \beta\bar{\gamma}\sigma\alpha^* \dots \alpha^*$, because $\sigma^2 \prec I$. Therefore $X = (\beta\bar{\gamma}\sigma\alpha^*)^m$ for some $m \geq 1$. Then by rotation $(\bar{\gamma}\sigma\alpha^*\beta)^m$ spans the socle of $e_x R$ and both $(\sigma\alpha^*\beta\bar{\gamma})^m$ and $(\alpha^*\beta\bar{\gamma}\sigma)^m$ span the socle of $e_a R$. In particular, they are equal up to a scalar.

Concluding, we obtain a basis of the local algebra $e_a Re_a = e_a \Lambda e_a$ formed by the following paths:

$$(\sigma\alpha^*\beta\bar{\gamma})^k \quad \text{and} \quad (\alpha^*\beta\bar{\gamma}\sigma)^k,$$

for $0 \leq k \leq m$, and $(\sigma\alpha^*\beta\bar{\gamma})^m = (\alpha^*\beta\bar{\gamma}\sigma)^m$ spans the socle of R_a . We denote by C and C_* the cycles $C = \sigma\alpha^*\beta\bar{\gamma}$, and $C_* = \alpha^*\beta\bar{\gamma}\sigma$, respectively.

Finally, because $C^m = C_*^m$ is in the socle, all initial subpaths of C and C_* are independent. Moreover, any path from x to j starting with $\gamma\alpha$ factors through $\bar{\gamma}$. As a result, involving previous relations (and rotations of C and C_* in the socle), we conclude that $e_x Re_j$ admits a basis of the form

$$\{(\bar{\gamma}\sigma\alpha^*\beta)^k \bar{\gamma}\sigma\alpha^*; 0 \leq k \leq m-1\},$$

so in particular, we have $c_{jx} = \dim e_x Re_j = m$. On the other hand, we similarly get the following m independent paths

$$(\beta\bar{\gamma}\sigma\alpha^*)^k \beta \in e_j Re_x,$$


for $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. But $\bar{\beta}$ is not involved in any relation, so it is another element of the basis, and we get $c_{xj} = \dim e_j Re_x = m+1 > c_{jx}$, which is impossible for a symmetric algebra R . \square

5. 1-VERTICES IN TRIANGLES

In this section we present a crucial result, which describes the local structure of Q near 1-vertices in triangles (see Proposition 5.1).


The main aim of this section is to prove the following result.

Proposition 5.1. *If $i \in Q_0$ is a 1-vertex in a triangle, then Q contains a block of the form*




Fix a GQT algebra $\Lambda = KQ/I$ and let us start with the following observation.

Lemma 5.2. *Let i be a 1-vertex in a triangle*




with $\gamma\alpha \not\prec I$. Then i is contained in the following block of Q :



Proof. Let i be a 1-vertex in a triangle as in the statement. Note first that the identity $p_i^- = p_i^+$ gives $p_x = p_j$. It follows that there are no loops at x and j . Indeed, if there is a loop at x , then $p_x^- = p_x^+$ implies that $p_i = p_j$, which gives a contradiction with Lemma 3.1, since $p_j = p_i^+$. Similarly, a loop at j gives $p_i = p_x = p_i^-$.

Because $\gamma\alpha \not\prec I$, we conclude that also $\alpha\beta \not\prec I$ and $\beta\gamma \not\prec I$, by Lemma 3.4 (γ and α are the unique arrows between their ends). It follows from Lemma 3.5 that x and j are 2-regular vertices, so Q admits the following subquiver



First, observe that $a \neq j$ (or equivalently, $b \neq x$). If this is not the case, then we get double arrows $\beta, \bar{\beta} : j \rightarrow x$. If $\alpha\beta \prec I$ or $\alpha\bar{\beta} \prec I$, then by Lemma 3.4, we get $\gamma\alpha \prec I$, which contradicts the assumption, so we obtain that $\alpha\beta \not\prec I$ and $\alpha\bar{\beta} \not\prec I$. But then we have a wild subquiver of type K_2^* given by arrows $\alpha, \beta, \bar{\beta}$. Hence indeed, both $a \neq j$ and $b \neq x$. In particular, neither $\alpha\beta$ nor $\alpha\bar{\beta}$ are involved in minimal relations of I , by Lemma 3.3. Dually, $\beta\gamma \not\prec I$ and $\beta^*\gamma \not\prec I$.

Now we will prove that $i^* = \bar{i}$. Suppose to the contrary that $i^* \neq \bar{i}$. Then it follows from Lemma 3.3 that $\alpha^*\beta \not\prec I$ and $\beta\bar{\gamma} \not\prec I$. If $\alpha^*\bar{\beta} \not\prec I$ or $\beta^*\bar{\gamma} \not\prec I$, then all paths of length two passing through j or x are not involved in minimal relations, so we obtain a wild subquiver of type $\tilde{\mathbb{D}}_4$. As a result, we may assume that both $\alpha^*\bar{\beta} \prec I$ and $\beta^*\bar{\gamma} \prec I$. In this case, we have two triangles

adjacent to the triangle $(\gamma \alpha \beta)$, and therefore, we deduce from Proposition 4.1 that both i^* and \bar{i} are 2-regular. But then we get a wild subcategory of type $\widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_6$ in the covering:

$$\circ \longrightarrow \bar{i} \xleftarrow{\bar{\gamma}} x \xrightarrow{\gamma} i \xrightarrow{\alpha} j \xrightarrow{\beta} x$$

$$\begin{array}{c} j \\ \beta \downarrow \\ x \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} i^* \\ \alpha^* \downarrow \\ j \end{array}$$

again a contradiction. Note that $\gamma\alpha\beta \not\prec I$ and $\beta\gamma\alpha \not\prec I$, due to Lemma 3.6 (and it dual), since we have no loops at x and j . Moreover, we have $\beta\gamma\alpha\beta \not\prec I$, by [14, Lemma 4.7], because this path passes through a 1-vertex i . So we proved that $i^* = \bar{i}$.

Next, observe that $a = b$, since for $a \neq b$, we would have $\beta^*\gamma\alpha, \gamma\alpha\bar{\beta} \not\prec I$, hence the following wild subcategory in the covering [14, see also Lemma 4.7].

$$b \xleftarrow{\bar{\beta}} j \xrightarrow{\beta} x \xrightarrow{\gamma} i \xrightarrow{\alpha} j \xrightarrow{\beta} x$$

$$\begin{array}{c} a \\ \beta^* \downarrow \\ x \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} b \\ \bar{\beta} \uparrow \\ j \end{array}$$

Consequently, we have $\bar{i} = i^*$ and $a = b$, and therefore, Q has a subquiver Γ of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & a & & \\ & \beta^* \swarrow & & \searrow \bar{\beta} & \\ & & i & & \\ & \gamma \swarrow & & \searrow \alpha & \\ x & & & & j \\ & \beta \swarrow & & \searrow \alpha^* & \\ & & \bar{i} & & \\ & \bar{\gamma} \swarrow & & \searrow & \end{array}$$

We claim that Γ is a block in Q with the unique white vertex \bar{i} . Indeed, the vertex a must be 1-regular, because otherwise, one gets a wild subcategory given as follows.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & a & \longrightarrow & \circ \\ & \bar{\beta} \uparrow & & \beta^* \downarrow & \\ i & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & j & \xrightarrow{\beta} & x \xrightarrow{\gamma} i \end{array}$$

Applying Lemma 3.3, we obtain $\beta^*\bar{\gamma} \not\prec I$ and $\alpha^*\bar{\beta} \not\prec I$. Consequently, we must have $\beta\bar{\gamma} \prec I$, since in case $\beta\bar{\gamma} \not\prec I$, we obtain the following wild subcategory of type $\widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_4$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & i & & \\ & \gamma \uparrow & & \beta \downarrow & \\ a & \xrightarrow{\beta^*} & x & \xleftarrow{\beta} & j \xrightarrow{\bar{\beta}} a \\ & & \bar{\gamma} \downarrow & & \\ & & \bar{i} & & \end{array}$$

Therefore, we get $\beta\bar{\gamma} \prec I$, and hence, also $\bar{\gamma}\alpha^* \prec I$, by 3.3. Thus there is a minimal relation of I of the form:

$$\bar{\gamma}\alpha^* = \gamma\alpha z,$$


for some $z \in \Lambda$ (after possibly adjusting α^*). Using the exact sequence for S_i , we conclude that there is an element $m \in e_j\Lambda e_x$ such that $m\gamma = 0$.

Now, it follows that \bar{i} is 2-regular. Indeed, otherwise α^* is the unique arrow starting at \bar{i} , so this yields an element $m\bar{\gamma} \in e_j\Lambda e_{\bar{i}}$ lying in the (right) socle of Λ , because $m\bar{\gamma}\alpha^* = m\gamma\alpha z = 0$. This

is impossible for a symmetric algebra. All arrows starting or ending at x, j, i are known, hence indeed, the subquiver Γ is a block in Q . \square


Now we are ready to prove Proposition 5.1 extending the above lemma.

Proof. (of Proposition 5.1) Let i be a 1-vertex in a triangle




Then it is clear from Lemma 3.5 that x and j are 2-vertices, hence there are arrows $\beta^* : a \rightarrow x$ and $\bar{\beta} : j \rightarrow b$ different from β and arrows $\bar{\gamma} : x \rightarrow \bar{i}$ and $\alpha^* : i^* \rightarrow j$ with $\bar{i}, i^* \neq i$.

We claim first that $a \neq j$ (equivalently, $b \neq x$). Suppose that this is not the case. Then $a = j$, $b = x$, and Q admits a subquiver of the form



with $\beta' = \beta^* = \bar{\beta}$. Moreover, there is no wild subcategory, hence $\alpha\beta \prec I$ or $\alpha\beta' \prec I$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\alpha\beta \prec I$. Then $\gamma\alpha \prec I$, by Lemma 3.4, since there is a triangle $(\gamma \alpha \beta)$ and there are no double arrows between x and i . As a result, we conclude that $i^* \neq \bar{i}$, because otherwise we obtain a subquiver forbidden in Lemma 4.4. Now $i^* \neq \bar{i}$ implies that we have no arrows $x \rightarrow i^*$, and therefore, both $\alpha^*\beta \not\prec I$ and $\alpha^*\beta' \not\prec I$, due to Lemma 3.3. But this is impossible, since then we get a wild subquiver of type K_2^* .

Consequently, we must have $a \neq j$ (and we can assume $b \neq x$). Then Q has a subquiver of the form



Obviously, we have $\alpha\bar{\beta} \not\prec I$ and $\beta^*\gamma \not\prec I$, by Lemma 3.3.

We will prove that $\bar{i} = i^*$ is a 2-regular vertex, whereas $a = b$ is 1-regular. Then of course, Q has the required local shape. To do this, we will investigate several idempotent algebras of Λ .

We can assume that there are no loops at x and j . Indeed, we have $p_x = p_i^- = p_i^+ = p_j$, because i is a 1-vertex. Moreover, a loop at x or j implies $p_i = p_j$ or $p_i = p_x$, respectively, and in both cases we have $\hat{p}_i = p_i$, which contradicts Lemma 3.1. Note also that i is a 1-vertex in a triangle, hence, we may further assume that $\gamma\alpha \prec I$ (the case $\gamma\alpha \not\prec I$ is already covered in Lemma 5.2).

(1) First, let us note some properties of relations in Λ which will be used further. Since there are no double arrows from j to x in Q ($a \neq j$), we deduce from Lemma 3.3 that $\gamma\alpha \prec I$ implies $\alpha\beta \prec I$ and $\beta\gamma \prec I$.

(1a) We may assume that $\alpha\beta = \beta\gamma = 0$ in Λ . To see this, consider the exact sequence for S_i :

$$0 \rightarrow \gamma\Lambda \rightarrow P_x \rightarrow P_j \rightarrow \alpha\Lambda \rightarrow 0.$$

We write down the minimal relation involving $\alpha\beta$, which is of the form

$$\alpha\beta + \alpha z\beta^* = 0,$$

for some $z \in J$, because α is the only arrow from i . We may replace β by $\beta := \beta + z\beta^*$ (adjusting presentation) and get $\alpha\beta = 0$. Then in fact $\beta\alpha = \Omega^2(S_i)$ and hence $\Omega^3(S_i) = \Omega^{-1}(S_i) = \gamma\alpha$ which gives $\beta\gamma = 0$.


(1b) Further, note that $\gamma\alpha = \bar{\gamma}z\alpha^*$ for some non-zero $z \in \Lambda$. Actually, from $\gamma\alpha \prec I$ we get a minimal relation in Λ of the form:

$$(*) \quad \gamma\alpha = \bar{\gamma}z_1\gamma\alpha + \bar{\gamma}z_2\alpha^* + \gamma\alpha z_3\alpha^*$$

We may assume $z_3 = 0$: if not we write as $\gamma\alpha u = \bar{\gamma}z_1\gamma\alpha + \bar{\gamma}z_2\alpha^*$, where $u = 1 - z_3\alpha^*$ is a unit. We post multiply with u^{-1} and get an expression analogous to $(*)$ but with $z_3 = 0$.


We may also assume that $z_1 = 0$, otherwise we write $(1 - \bar{\gamma}z_1)\gamma\alpha = \bar{\gamma}z_2\alpha^*$. We premultiply with the inverse of $1 - \bar{\gamma}z_1$ and get similarly an expression of the form as stated in (1b)

(2) Now, let $f = e_x + e_j$ and consider the idempotent algebra $R = e\Lambda e$, where $e = f + e_i$. We claim that $R = KQ_R/I_R$ is given by the following quiver:



Clearly, Q_R contains a triangle induced from the arrows γ, α, β in Q . In particular, we have also $\alpha\beta = \beta\gamma = 0$ in R and $\gamma\alpha \prec I_R$. The arrow β cannot be in the right (or left) socle of R , and hence Q_R admits at least one arrow $\gamma' \neq \gamma$ starting at x (respectively, arrow $\alpha' \neq \alpha$ ending at j). Similarly, γ and α are not in the socle, so we have additional arrows $\beta', \beta'' \neq \beta$ starting at j and ending at x , respectively. Note that i is still a 1-vertex in Q_R , and consequently, all the arrows $\alpha', \gamma', \beta', \beta''$ start and end at vertices x or j . If β' is not a loop, then we have double arrows from j to x , and hence, due to tameness of R , we get that γ', α' are not loops. In this case, we must have one arrow $\gamma' = \alpha' : x \rightarrow j$ and $\beta'' = \beta'$, and Q_R has required shape.

Therefore, it remains to exclude the case when β' is a loop. If this is the case, then β'' is a loop, since otherwise, we get a wild subcategory formed by the double arrows $\beta, \beta'' : j \rightarrow x$ and a loop β' . It follows that either $\gamma' = \alpha'$ is an arrow $x \rightarrow j$ or $\gamma' = \beta''$ and $\alpha' = \beta'$, and then Q_R consists of triangle and two loops $\gamma' = \beta''$ at x and $\beta' = \alpha'$ at j . In the first case, we obtain the following wild subcategory in covering:



In the second case, $\gamma\alpha \prec I_R$ implies that $\gamma\alpha = \gamma'z'\beta'$, where z' must have a factor $\gamma\alpha$ since this is the only way to get from x to j . So we actually have


$$\gamma\alpha = \gamma'z_1\gamma\alpha z_2\beta'$$

In general if $\theta = u\theta v$ with u, v in the radical then it follows that $\theta = 0$, because $\theta = u\theta v = u(u\theta v)v = u^r\theta v^r$ and this eventually becomes zero. It follows that $\gamma\alpha = 0$, but then γ is in the socle, a contradiction. Therefore, Q_R is of required form.


(3) Next, we prove that $\bar{i} = i^*$. Let $\bar{i} \neq i^*$, and consider the idempotent algebras $\bar{R} = \bar{e}\Lambda\bar{e}$, $R^* = e^*\Lambda e^*$, and $\hat{R} = \hat{e}\Lambda\hat{e}$, where $\bar{e} = f + e_{\bar{i}}$, $e^* = f + e_{i^*}$ and $\hat{e} = f + e_{\bar{i}} + e_{i^*}$. The quiver $Q_{\bar{R}}$ obviously has arrows $\beta : j \rightarrow x$ and $\bar{\gamma} : x \rightarrow \bar{i}$, hence a path from j to \bar{i} . Moreover, $\bar{\gamma}$ is the

unique arrow in $Q_{\bar{R}}$ starting at x , due to (1b). Because \bar{R} is symmetric, we must have a path in $Q_{\bar{R}}$ from x to j , hence an arrow $\delta : \bar{i} \rightarrow j$.


(3a) We will show that the Gabriel quiver of \bar{R} is of the form




First, observe that there is another arrow $\beta' : j \rightarrow x$, $\beta' \neq \beta$, in $Q_{\bar{R}}$. Indeed, consider the idempotent algebra $\bar{S} = (\bar{e} + e_i)\Lambda(\bar{e} + e_i)$. Its quiver contains arrows $\gamma, \alpha, \beta, \delta$ and $\bar{\gamma}$. Moreover, both algebra R and \bar{R} are idempotent algebras of \bar{S} . We have the second arrow $\beta' : j \rightarrow x$ in $Q_{\bar{R}}$, so there must be a corresponding path in $Q_{\bar{S}}$, which does not factor through β . As a result, there is an arrow $\beta' \neq \beta$ in $Q_{\bar{S}}$ starting at j and ending at x or \bar{i} . In the first case, we get required double arrows in $Q_{\bar{S}}$, hence in $Q_{\bar{R}}$, so we have to exclude an arrow $\beta' : j \rightarrow \bar{i}$ in $Q_{\bar{S}}$. In fact, then we have a path $\beta'\gamma'$ in $Q_{\bar{S}}$, $\gamma' : \bar{i} \rightarrow x$, and the quiver $Q_{\bar{S}}$ contains the following subquiver.



We cannot have a loop μ at \bar{i} , because then we would have the following wild subcategory in covering:




Consequently, the above subquiver is the whole $Q_{\bar{S}}$ (no loops at x, j , since it would give loops in Q_R). But then the algebra $R_1 = f\Lambda f = f\bar{S}f$ is given by the forbidden quiver



and we obtain a contradiction with Lemma 4.2 (note that $\beta'\gamma' \notin I_{\bar{S}}$, since otherwise, there is only one arrow $j \rightarrow x$ in $Q_{\bar{R}}$). Therefore, we proved that β' cannot be an arrow $j \rightarrow \bar{i}$, and hence, it must be the second arrow $j \rightarrow x$ in $Q_{\bar{S}}$, so also in $Q_{\bar{R}}$.

In a similar way, one can prove that there is at least one further arrow in $Q_{\bar{R}}$ (besides $\beta, \beta', \bar{\gamma}$ and δ). Otherwise consider the idempotent algebra $R_1 = fRf$. This is tame symmetric given by the following quiver:




and we obtain a contradiction with Lemma 4.2 again.

As a result, we must have one more arrow in $Q_{\bar{R}}$. It cannot start at x , because all paths in Q_{Λ} factor through $\bar{\gamma}$ (modulo I), so this is the unique arrow in $Q_{\bar{R}}$ starting at x . It cannot also start at j (or end at x), otherwise this would yield a wild subcategory of \bar{R} . This leaves to consider the case when the new arrow starts at \bar{i} .


Suppose there is an arrow $\delta_1 : \bar{i} \rightarrow j$. Since \bar{R} is tame, one of $\bar{\gamma}\delta$, $\bar{\gamma}\delta_1$ is in some relation, and after adjusting δ_1 (if necessary) we may assume $\bar{\gamma}\delta_1 = 0$ ($\bar{\gamma}$ is the unique arrow in $Q_{\bar{R}}$ starting from \bar{i}). Then $R_1 = f\bar{R}f$ is of the same form as above, and we get similar contradiction with Lemma 4.2.

This actually proves that there is a loop ρ at vertex \bar{i} of $Q_{\bar{R}}$, and there are no other arrows, so $Q_{\bar{R}}$ indeed has the required shape.

Using dual arguments, one can show that the idempotent algebra R^* is given by the same quiver as \bar{R} :



(3b) We will prove that none of the paths $\bar{\gamma}\delta$, $\bar{\gamma}\rho$ and $\bar{\gamma}\rho\delta$ is involved in minimal relations defining \bar{R} . First, suppose $\bar{\gamma}\rho \prec I_{\bar{R}}$. Because $\bar{\gamma}$ is the unique arrow in $Q_{\bar{R}}$ starting at x , we conclude that $\bar{\gamma}\rho = 0$ (after possibly adjusting ρ). But then the idempotent algebra $R_1 = f\bar{R}f$ is given by the quiver



which is impossible, due to Lemma 4.2. In the same way, one can show that $\bar{\gamma}\rho\delta \not\prec I_{\bar{R}}$.

Now, let $\bar{\gamma}\delta \prec I_{\bar{R}}$. As above, after adjusting δ , we can assume $\bar{\gamma}\delta = 0$. We will show that $\rho^2 \not\prec I_{\bar{R}}$. Suppose to the contrary $\rho^2 \prec I_{\bar{R}}$. We may assume that $\delta\beta' \not\prec I_{\bar{R}}$, because we have double arrows. In this case, the local algebra $e_{\bar{i}}Re_{\bar{i}}$ is generated by ρ and $Y = \delta\beta\bar{\gamma}$. Note that $\bar{\gamma}Y = 0 = Y\delta$, because $\bar{\gamma}\delta = 0$, hence in particular, we have $Y^2 = 0$. Now, by our assumption, the radical of this local algebra is spanned by the monomials in ρ, Y with ρ and Y alternating. So we can write

$$\rho^2 = c_0\rho Y + c_1\rho Y\rho + c_2\rho Y\rho Y + \cdots + d_0Y + d_1Y\rho + \cdots = \rho U_1 Y + \rho U_2 \rho + Y U_3 Y + Y U_4 \rho,$$

where U_2 is in the radical. Then $\bar{\gamma}\rho^2\delta = \bar{\gamma}\rho U_2 \rho \delta$ with each term in $J_{R_1}^2$, since $\bar{\gamma}\rho Y \rho \delta = \bar{\gamma}\rho \delta \cdot \beta \cdot \bar{\gamma}\rho \delta$. But then the path $\bar{\gamma}\rho^2\delta$ cannot induce an arrow in Q_{R_1} . Premultiplying the above identity by ρ and using the same argument, we conclude that $\bar{\gamma}\rho^3\delta$ is not an arrow in Q_{R_1} , and inductively, we get the same conclusion for any path of the form $\bar{\gamma}\rho^a\delta$. This shows that the quiver of R_1 has the form forbidden in Lemma 4.2.

This shows that ρ^2 is not involved in a minimal relation of $I_{\bar{R}}$. Therefore, in a covering of \bar{R} we have the following subcategory

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & j & & \\
 & & & & \downarrow \beta & & \\
 & & & & x & & \\
 & & & & \downarrow \bar{\gamma} & & \\
 j & \xrightarrow{\beta} & x & \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} & \bar{i} & \xleftarrow{\rho} & \bar{i} & \xleftarrow{\rho} & \bar{i} & \xrightarrow{\delta} & j
 \end{array}$$

All paths of length 2 are non-zero, since the corresponding paths in \bar{R} are not involved in relations (note that $\beta\bar{\gamma} \notin I$, by Lemma 3.3, since $i^* \neq \bar{i}$, and $\beta, \bar{\gamma}$ remain arrows in $Q_{\bar{R}}$, so also $\beta\bar{\gamma} \notin I_{\bar{R}}$). Finally, the unique path of length 3, i.e. $\beta\bar{\gamma}\rho$ is also not involved in a minimal relation of $I_{\bar{R}}$. If it was, we would get the following minimal relation in \bar{R} :

$$\beta\bar{\gamma}\rho + \beta\bar{\gamma}\rho z = 0,$$

with $z \in J_{\bar{R}}$, because $\bar{\gamma}\delta = 0$ and $\beta'\bar{\gamma} \prec I_{\bar{R}}$. Now adjusting $\rho := \rho + \rho z$, we obtain $\beta\bar{\gamma}\rho = 0$. Similarly, we have $\beta\bar{\gamma}\delta = 0$, and consequently, the path $\beta\bar{\gamma}$ belongs to the (right) socle of \bar{R} , a contradiction. As a result, all paths in the above subquiver are not involved in minimal relations of $I_{\bar{R}}$, and hence, it gives a wild hereditary subcategory (in covering).

Summing up, it has been proven above that the paths $\bar{\gamma}\delta, \bar{\gamma}\rho$ and $\bar{\gamma}\rho\delta$ are not involved in minimal relations of $I_{\bar{R}}$. Using dual arguments for the second idempotent algebra R^* one can show that the paths $\varepsilon\alpha^*, \varepsilon\rho'$ and $\varepsilon\rho'\alpha^*$ are not involved in minimal relations of I_{R^*} .

(3c) We will find other wild subcategories, but this time in a covering of \hat{R} . Note first that the quiver $Q_{\hat{R}}$ of \hat{R} contain arrows $\beta, \bar{\gamma}, \alpha^*$ induced from arrows in Q , and additionally, the second arrow β' appearing in all previous algebras R, \bar{R}, R^* . The arrows $\beta, \beta', \bar{\gamma}, \alpha^*$ exhaust all arrows in $Q_{\hat{R}}$ starting or ending at x or j . It follows from symmetricity that there is at least one arrow $\xi : \bar{i} \rightarrow i^*$. We know from (3a) and (3a') that there are loops ρ and η in quivers of \bar{R} and R^* , respectively, therefore we must have cyclic paths $\bar{i} \rightsquigarrow \bar{i}$ and $i^* \rightsquigarrow i^*$ in $Q_{\hat{R}}$ not containing β . In consequence, $Q_{\hat{R}}$ either: 1) admits an arrow $\xi' : i^* \rightarrow \bar{i}$, or 2) two loops ρ and η at \bar{i} and i^* .

1) In the first case, the quiver $\hat{Q} = Q_{\hat{R}}$ consists of arrows $\beta, \beta', \bar{\gamma}, \alpha^*, \xi, \xi'$, and possibly, a second arrow $\zeta : \bar{i} \rightarrow i^*$. Indeed, all other arrows are arrows starting and ending at \bar{i} or i^* , and we cannot have one more arrow $i^* \rightarrow \bar{i}$, because we would obtain a wild subquiver of type K_2^- . Hence, there is at most one additional arrow $\zeta : \bar{i} \rightarrow i^*$, and possibly loops at \bar{i} or i^* . We can choose a basis \mathcal{B} of \hat{R} consisting of paths in \hat{Q} such that

- the set $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ of all subpaths of paths in \mathcal{B} which start and end in x, j, \bar{i} generates \bar{R} , and
- the set of paths $\bar{\mathcal{P}} \subset \bar{\mathcal{R}}$ which are not products of shorter paths in $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ is a set of representatives of arrows in $Q_{\bar{R}}$.

Let now φ denote the path in $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ corresponding to the arrow δ in $Q_{\bar{R}}$. In case there is a loop $\rho : \bar{i} \rightarrow \bar{i}$ in \hat{Q} , it induces a loop ρ in $Q_{\bar{R}}$, hence the path φ is always starting with ξ or ζ . It follows that there is no loop at \bar{i} . Indeed, if $\psi : \bar{i} \rightarrow \bar{i}$ is a loop in \hat{Q} , then we get the following

wild subcategory in a covering of \hat{R} :

$$\begin{array}{c}
 j \\
 \downarrow \beta \\
 x \\
 \downarrow \bar{\gamma} \\
 \begin{array}{ccccc}
 j & \xleftarrow{\alpha^*} & i^* & \xrightarrow{\xi'} & \bar{i} & \xleftarrow{\psi} & \bar{i} & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & j
 \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

Note that the path φ is not involved in any relation defining $\hat{R} = K\hat{Q}/\hat{I}$, because otherwise, we have $\varphi \prec I_{\bar{R}}$, which is impossible, since φ represents an arrow in $Q_{\bar{R}}$. Dually, using the path σ in \hat{Q} , which corresponds to the arrow ε in Q_{R^*} , one can prove that there are no loops in \hat{Q} at i^* .

As a result, we proved that \hat{Q} consists of arrows $\beta, \beta', \bar{\gamma}, \alpha^*, \xi, \xi'$ and possibly $\zeta : \bar{i} \rightarrow i^*$. If we have double arrows $\xi, \zeta : \bar{i} \rightarrow i^*$, then one of the paths $\xi\alpha^*$ or $\zeta\alpha^*$ is involved in a minimal relation of \hat{I} , since otherwise, we would get a wild subcategory of type K_2^* . Without loss of generality, assume that $\zeta\alpha^* \prec \hat{I}$, but $\xi\alpha^* \not\prec \hat{I}$. Then any path in \mathcal{B} from \bar{i} to j is of the form $(\xi\xi')^k\alpha^*$, hence independently of \mathcal{B} , we will always have $\xi\xi'$ and $\xi\alpha^*$ in $\bar{\mathcal{P}}$. Similarly, one can take a subset $\mathcal{P}^* \subset \mathcal{B}$ which gives the arrows of Q_{R^*} , and then $\xi'\xi$ and $\bar{\gamma}\xi$ will be always in \mathcal{P}^* . Consequently, we may identify the induced arrows δ, ρ in $Q_{\bar{R}}$ (respectively, arrows ε, ρ' in Q_{R^*}) with the following paths in \hat{Q} :

$$\delta = \xi\alpha^*, \quad \rho = \xi\xi', \quad \varepsilon = \bar{\gamma}\xi, \quad \text{and} \quad \rho' = \xi'\xi.$$

Therefore, using (3b) we conclude that there is a wild (hereditary) subcategory in covering of \hat{R} of the following the form:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & j & & x & \\
 & & & \uparrow \alpha^* & & \downarrow \bar{\gamma} & \\
 x & \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} & \bar{i} & \xrightarrow{\xi} & i^* & \xrightarrow{\xi'} & \bar{i} & \xrightarrow{\xi} & i^*
 \end{array}$$

2) For the second case, when \hat{Q} admits two loops ρ, ρ' , we clearly have no more arrows in \hat{Q} , since adding any other arrow makes the algebra wild. In this case, we may fix a basis of \hat{R} containing paths $\bar{\gamma}\xi$ and $\xi\alpha^*$, which after passing to idempotent algebras induce arrows ε in Q_{R^*} and δ in $Q_{\bar{R}}$. Further, this basis cannot contain longer paths of the form $\bar{\gamma}\rho^p\xi$ or $\xi(\rho')^p\alpha^*$, for $p \geq 1$, because then we would get more than one arrow $x \rightarrow i^*$ in Q_{R^*} or more than one arrow $\bar{i} \rightarrow j$ in $Q_{\bar{R}}$. As a result, the algebra $R_1 = f\hat{R}f$ is given by the following quiver

$$\begin{array}{c}
 x \rightleftarrows j \\
 \text{with a curved arrow } x \rightarrow j
 \end{array}$$

where the unique arrow $x \rightarrow j$ is identified with the path $\bar{\gamma}\xi\alpha^*$ in \hat{Q} . This contradicts Lemma 4.2.

Consequently, we have proven that indeed $\bar{i} = i^*$. In the remaining two steps we will show that this vertex is 2-regular (in Q) and that $a = b$ is 1-regular.

(4) We show that \bar{i} is a 2-vertex in Q : Indeed, if \bar{i} was a 1-regular vertex, we would get $\gamma\alpha$ involved in a minimal relation of the form

$$\gamma\alpha = \bar{\gamma}\alpha^*\zeta,$$

for some ζ is in $e_j\Lambda e_j$. Now, consider the exact sequence for $S_{\bar{i}}$:

$$0 \rightarrow S_{\bar{i}} \rightarrow P_{\bar{i}} \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} P_x \xrightarrow{d_2} P_j \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} P_{\bar{i}} \rightarrow S_{\bar{i}} \rightarrow 0.$$

The middle map d_2 is given by an element $\bar{m} \in e_j J e_x$ satisfying $\bar{m}\bar{\gamma} = 0$. But then, we obtain $\bar{m}\bar{\gamma}\alpha = \bar{m}\bar{\gamma}\alpha^*\zeta = 0$. Because α is the unique arrow starting at i , we conclude that $\bar{m}\bar{\gamma}$ is a socle element in $e_j\Lambda e_i$, a contradiction. Therefore, $i^* = \bar{i}$ is indeed a 2-regular vertex in Q .

(5) We will show that $a = b$. Assume that this is not the case, and take the idempotent algebra $\tilde{R} = \tilde{e}\Lambda\tilde{e}$, given by $\tilde{e} = e + e_{\bar{i}} + e_a + e_b$.

We will prove first that its Gabriel quiver $\tilde{Q} = Q_{\tilde{R}}$ admits a loop at vertex \bar{i} . Indeed, as in the proof of Lemma ??, we may fix a basis \mathcal{B} of Λ such that the set \mathcal{R} of subpaths of elements in \mathcal{B} with source and target in x, j, i, \bar{i}, a, b generates \tilde{R} and the associated subset $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{R}$ of paths, which are not products of shorter paths in \mathcal{R} , represent the set of arrows of \tilde{Q} .

Now, consider the same construction for an idempotent algebra $\bar{R} = \bar{e}\tilde{R}\bar{e} = \bar{e}\Lambda\bar{e}$. As above, we may pick a basis $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ of \tilde{R} (consisting of paths in \tilde{Q}) such that the set $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ of subpaths of elements in $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ with source and target in x, j, \bar{i} generates \bar{R} and the associated subset $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ of paths, which are not products of shorter paths in $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$, determine the arrows of $Q_{\bar{R}}$.

Recall that the Gabriel quiver $Q_{\bar{R}}$ is known by (3a), we showed that it consists of arrows $\beta, \beta', \bar{\gamma}, \alpha^*$ and a loop ρ . The first three arrows are arrows in both Q and \tilde{Q} , and the remaining two correspond to paths in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$.

The arrow $\beta' : j \rightarrow x$ is induced from a path in \tilde{Q} from j to x , which does not pass through vertices x, j, \bar{i} . It cannot pass through i , since it would then must have passed through x earlier, so it can only pass through a and b . It follows, that there is an arrow $\zeta : b \rightarrow a$ in \tilde{Q} and β' is represented by a path $\bar{\beta}u\beta^*$ with u a path of the form

$$b \xrightarrow{\zeta} a \longrightarrow b \longrightarrow \dots \longrightarrow a,$$

where we do not indicate possible loops at a or b , which may appear in u .

Further, we have a loop $\rho : \bar{i} \rightarrow \bar{i}$ in \bar{R} , which corresponds to a path from \bar{i} to \bar{i} in \tilde{Q} , passing only through vertices a, b . Consequently, ρ is represented by one of the following paths in \tilde{Q} :

- a) $\rho = \sigma v \eta$, for some arrows $\sigma : \bar{i} \rightarrow b, \eta : a \rightarrow \bar{i}$ and a path $v : b \rightarrow a \rightarrow b \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow a$,
- b) $\rho = \sigma w \eta$, for some arrows $\sigma : \bar{i} \rightarrow a, \eta : b \rightarrow \bar{i}$ and a path $w : a \rightarrow b \rightarrow a \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow b$, or
- c) ρ is a loop in \tilde{Q} .

We will exclude a) and b)

Case a) Then the subquiver of \tilde{Q} formed by arrows $\alpha, \alpha^*, \bar{\beta}$ and σ gives rise to a wild subcategory if $\alpha^*\bar{\beta} \not\prec I_{\tilde{R}}$, so we have $\alpha^*\bar{\beta} \prec I_{\tilde{R}}$. Dually, using subquiver formed by $\gamma, \bar{\gamma}, \beta^*$ and η , we deduce that $\beta^*\bar{\gamma} \prec I_{\tilde{R}}$. Because $\alpha^*, \beta^*, \bar{\beta}$ and $\bar{\gamma}$ are arrows of Q , so these paths are also involved in minimal relations of I . Consequently, due to Lemma 3.3, we obtain two more arrows $\sigma^* : b \rightarrow \bar{i}$ and $\eta^* : \bar{i} \rightarrow a$ in Q , and hence, also in \tilde{Q} . But then, we get the following wild subcategory of

type $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}_6$ (in a covering of \widetilde{R}):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & i & & & \\
 & & & \uparrow \gamma & & & \\
 & & & x & & & \\
 & & & \downarrow \bar{\gamma} & & & \\
 x & \xleftarrow{\beta^*} & a & \xrightarrow{\eta} & \bar{i} & \xleftarrow{\sigma^*} & b & \xrightarrow{\zeta} & a & \xleftarrow{\eta^*} & \bar{i}
 \end{array}$$

Case b) Then \widetilde{Q} admits at least one arrow $\zeta' : a \rightarrow b$. It follows from relations in (1b) that $\gamma\alpha = \bar{\gamma}z\alpha^*$, so we have $e_j J_{\widetilde{R}}^2 = \bar{\gamma} J_{\widetilde{R}}$. Note that we have no more arrows in \widetilde{Q} between a and b , because otherwise, we get a wild subquiver of type K_2^\pm . Moreover, there are no loops at a and b , since a loop at a or b easily gives a wild hereditary subcategory of type $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}_6$ with three arrows meeting at a or b .

Hence \widetilde{Q} consists of the seven arrows $\gamma, \alpha, \beta, \bar{\gamma}, \alpha^*, \bar{\beta}, \beta^*$ from Q and $\sigma, \eta, \zeta, \zeta'$. Observe also that the path ρ in \widetilde{Q} corresponds to a loop ρ in $Q_{\widetilde{R}}$, and it has the form $\rho = \sigma\zeta'\zeta \dots \zeta'\eta$, hence we infer that both $\sigma\zeta' \not\prec I_{\widetilde{R}}$ and $\zeta'\eta \not\prec I_{\widetilde{R}}$. It follows that $\beta^*\bar{\gamma} \prec I_{\widetilde{R}}$, since otherwise, we obtain the following wild subcategory

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 a & \xrightarrow{\zeta'} & b \\
 \beta^* \downarrow & \nearrow \gamma & \downarrow \eta \\
 x & & i \\
 & \searrow \bar{\gamma} & \downarrow \bar{i}
 \end{array}$$

Similarly, using $\sigma\zeta' \not\prec I_{\widetilde{R}}$, we deduce that $\alpha^*\bar{\beta} \prec I_{\widetilde{R}}$. But $\alpha^*, \beta^*, \bar{\gamma}$ and $\bar{\beta}$ are arrows in Q , so in fact, both paths $\beta^*\bar{\gamma}$ and $\alpha^*\bar{\beta}$ are involved in minimal relations of I . Consequently, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that σ and η are actually arrows in Q , hence we conclude that also $\bar{\gamma}\sigma \prec I$, due to the Triangle Lemma. Now, because any path from x to a factors through $\bar{\gamma}$, we obtain a relation in $I_{\widetilde{R}}$ of the form

$$\bar{\gamma}\sigma + \bar{\gamma}z = 0$$

with $z \in J_{\widetilde{R}}^2$. But then, substituting $\sigma := \sigma + z$, we get a new presentation with $\bar{\gamma}\sigma = 0$.


Now, we can similarly show that $\bar{\gamma}\alpha^* \prec I_{\widetilde{R}}$ implies $\bar{\gamma}\alpha^* = 0$ (possibly adjusting α^*), and then we get an arrow $\bar{\gamma}$ in the socle of \widetilde{R} . Therefore, we must have $\bar{\gamma}\alpha^* \not\prec I_{\widetilde{R}}$.

As a result, we conclude that $\bar{\gamma}\alpha^*$ is the unique path in \mathcal{B} which does not factor through x, j . But then, the associated idempotent algebra $R_1 = f\widetilde{R}f$ is given by the following quiver

$$x \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\quad} \\ \xrightarrow{\quad} \\ \xrightarrow{\quad} \end{array} j$$

where the unique arrow $x \rightarrow j$ represents the path $\bar{\gamma}\alpha^*$, so we obtain a contradiction with Lemma 4.2. This finally proves that cases a) and b) cannot happen, and we are left with c). This completes the proof of (5).


It follows that \tilde{Q} has a subquiver of the form:



where $\gamma, \alpha, \beta, \bar{\gamma}, \bar{\beta}, \alpha^*, \beta^*$ are all arrows in \tilde{Q} that start or end at vertices x, i, j .

(6) We will investigate arrows starting or ending with a or b .

Observe first that there is no arrow $\tau : a \rightarrow \bar{i}$ in \tilde{Q} , because otherwise, we would get a wild subcategory of the form



Using dual arguments, one can similarly prove that there is no arrow $\bar{i} \rightarrow b$ in \tilde{Q} .


(7) We will prove that a and b cannot both be 1-regular in \tilde{Q} . Assume for a contradiction that both a, b are 1-regular vertices of \tilde{Q} . First, using exact sequences for periodic simple modules S_x, S_j and S_i in $\text{mod } \Lambda$, we obtain the following equalities of dimension vectors

$$p_b + p_x = p_j^+ = p_j^- = p_i + p_{\bar{i}} = p_x^+ = p_x^- = p_a + p_j \quad \text{and} \quad p_x = p_j.$$

As a result, we get $p_a = p_b$, and hence, also dimension vectors of corresponding projective \tilde{R} -modules are equal: $[e_a \tilde{R}] = [e_b \tilde{R}]$. Now, because ζ is the unique arrow in \tilde{Q} starting at b , we have $\zeta \tilde{R} \simeq \Omega_{\tilde{R}}(S_b)$, so $[\zeta \tilde{R}] = [e_b \tilde{R}] - s_b$. On the other hand, ζ is the unique arrow in \tilde{Q} ending at a , so $\zeta \tilde{R} = \Omega_{\tilde{R}}^{-1}(S_a)$ and it has dimension vector $[\zeta \tilde{R}] = [e_a \tilde{R}] - s_a$. Involving the previous equality, we get $s_a = s_b$, a contradiction. This proves the claim.

(8) We will show now that this leads to a contradiction in case a is not a 1-vertex. The arguments in case when b is not 1-regular are dual.

Suppose first that $|a^-| \geq 2$, and let $\eta : y \rightarrow a$ be the second arrow $\eta \neq \zeta$ ending at a . If $y = \bar{i}$, then we obtain the following wild subcategory in the covering of \tilde{R} .



Hence, we may assume that η starts at b or a . In particular, there are no arrows $\bar{i} \rightarrow a$, so we conclude as above that $\beta^*\bar{\gamma} \not\prec \tilde{I}$. Dually, we can prove that there are no arrows $b \rightarrow \bar{i}$, so $\alpha^*\bar{\beta} \not\prec \tilde{I}$.

If η is a loop $\eta : a \rightarrow a$, then we get the following wild subcategory

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 & & & i & & & i & & \\
 & & & \uparrow \gamma & & & \downarrow \alpha & & \\
 a & \xleftarrow{\eta} & a & \xrightarrow{\beta^*} & x & \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} & \bar{i} & \xleftarrow{\rho} & \bar{i} & \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} & j & \xrightarrow{\bar{\beta}} & b
 \end{array}$$

Therefore, we can assume that η is an arrow $b \rightarrow a$, and we have double arrows from $\zeta, \eta : b \rightarrow a$. Moreover, if there is an arrow $\sigma : a \rightarrow z$ different from β^* , then replacing η by σ , we get a wild subcategory of the same type. Hence, one may assume that β^* is the unique arrow in \tilde{Q} starting at b . In this case, one of $\zeta\beta^*$ or $\eta\beta^*$ is involved in a minimal relation of \tilde{I} , since otherwise, we get a wild subquiver of type K_2^* . Since β^* is the unique arrow in \tilde{Q} starting at a , we conclude that exactly one, say $\zeta\beta^* \prec \tilde{I}$ and $\eta\beta^* \not\prec \tilde{I}$. Then we have also $\eta\beta^*\bar{\gamma}, \eta\beta^*\gamma \not\prec \tilde{I}$. Indeed, if $\eta\beta^*\bar{\gamma} \prec \tilde{I}$, then it is involved in a minimal relation of the form

$$\eta\beta^*\bar{\gamma} = \eta\beta^*\bar{\gamma}\Sigma$$

with $\Sigma \in J_{\tilde{R}}$. Hence, by repeated substitution, we get $\eta\beta^*\bar{\gamma} = 0$. It follows that either $\eta\beta^*\gamma = 0$, and then $\eta\beta^*$ is in the socle, or $\eta\beta^*\gamma \neq 0$ is in the socle of \tilde{R} . Now, suppose that $\eta\beta^*\gamma \prec \tilde{I}$. Then adjusting γ , we get $\eta\beta^*\gamma = 0$, and in this case $\beta^*\gamma \neq 0$ is in the socle of \tilde{R} (we have $\zeta\beta^*\gamma = 0$, because $\zeta\beta^*$ is involved in a minimal relation of the form $\zeta\beta^* = z_1\eta\beta^* + z_2\beta$).

As a result, we obtain the following wild subcategory in a covering:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 & & & i & & & i & & \\
 & & & \uparrow \gamma & & & \downarrow \alpha & & \\
 b & \xrightarrow{\eta} & a & \xrightarrow{\beta^*} & x & \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} & \bar{i} & \xleftarrow{\rho} & \bar{i} & \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} & j & \xrightarrow{\bar{\beta}} & b
 \end{array}$$


Finally, we are left with the case when a is not 1-regular in \tilde{Q} , but $|a^-| = 1$. Then ζ is the unique arrow in \tilde{Q} ending at a and there is an arrow $a \rightarrow y$ different from β^* . In particular, it follows that $\beta^*\bar{\gamma} \not\prec \tilde{I}$ (no arrows $\bar{i} \rightarrow a$), and we obtain the same wild subcategory as in the case of a loop $\eta : a \rightarrow a$, but we use the second arrow $a \rightarrow y$ (different from β^*), instead of the resolved loop η .

This eventually shows that $a = b$.

(9) Finally, it remains to prove that $a = b$ is a 1-vertex in Q . Suppose that a is a 2-vertex with $a^+ = \{\beta^*, \eta\}$ and $a^- = \{\bar{\beta}, \sigma\}$. Let first both $\alpha^*\bar{\beta} \prec I$ and $\beta^*\bar{\gamma} \prec I$. It follows from Lemma 3.3 that then we have two arrows $\eta : a \rightarrow \bar{i}$ and $\sigma : \bar{i} \rightarrow a$, and hence, the quiver Q has a form forbidden in Corollary 4.3.


Consequently, one of $\alpha^*\bar{\beta}$ or $\beta^*\bar{\gamma}$ is not involved in a minimal relation. In fact, we can assume that both $\alpha^*\bar{\beta}, \beta^*\bar{\gamma} \not\prec I$, because if $\alpha^*\bar{\beta} \not\prec I$ but $\beta^*\bar{\gamma} \prec I$, then by Lemma 3.3, we conclude

that there is an arrow $\sigma : \bar{i} \rightarrow a$, and hence, the following wild subactegory in covering.



Thus, we have both $\alpha^*\bar{\beta} \not\prec I$ and $\beta^*\bar{\gamma} \not\prec I$. Applying Lemma 3.4, we deduce that also $\sigma\beta^* \not\prec I$ and $\bar{\beta}\eta \not\prec I$, because i is a 1-vertex. On the other hand, there are no arrows $x \rightarrow j$ in Q , so using Lemma 3.3 again, we get $\bar{\beta}\beta^* \not\prec I$, and therefore, there is at most one path of length 2 passing through a , which is involved in a minimal relation of I (and it is $\sigma\eta$).

As a result, we obtain the following wild one-relation algebra in covering (see RiII):



□

6. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

(1) We start by setting the scene. Assume $i \in Q_0$ is a 1-vertex, i.e. Q has a subquiver

$$x \xrightarrow{\gamma} i \xrightarrow{\alpha} j$$

Obviously, if $x = j$ then i belongs to a block B of type V1 and Q is glueing of B with the rest part of the quiver, so the claim holds in this case. We assume further that $x \neq j$ and we will show that then i belongs to a block of type V2.

It is clear from Lemma 3.5 that then x and j are 2-regular vertices of Q , and hence Q has the following subquiver

$$(*) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} \bar{i} & \xleftarrow{\bar{\gamma}} & x & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & i & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & j & \xleftarrow{\alpha^*} & i^* \\ & \nearrow \delta & \uparrow \delta^* & & & & \downarrow \nu & \searrow \bar{\nu} & \\ a & & b & & & & c & & d \end{array}$$

If $\gamma\alpha \prec I$, then i belongs to a triangle, by Lemma 3.3, hence it follows from Proposition 5.1 that i belongs to a block of required shape (the quiver in 5.1 is a glueing of a block of type V2 containing i with a triangle). Therefore, we may assume that i is not a part of a triangle in Q . In other words, vertices a and b are different from j , or equivalently, vertices c, d are different from x ; in particular, by Lemma 3.3, we get $\gamma\alpha \not\prec I$ and both $\alpha\nu \not\prec I$ and $\alpha\bar{\nu} \not\prec I$. Similarly, $\delta\gamma \not\prec I$ and $\delta^*\gamma \not\prec I$. Moreover, we have $a \neq b$ and $c \neq d$, since otherwise, we would get a wild subquiver of type K_2^* .

(2) We will show that $\{a, b\} \cap \{c, d\}$ is not empty. Suppose to the contrary that $\{a, b\} \cap \{c, d\}$ is empty. Then it follows from Lemma 3.6 that for every path π of length 3 in $(*)$, we have $\pi \not\prec I$. Moreover, applying [14, Lemma 4.7], we conclude that also all paths of length 4 in $(*)$ are not involved in minimal relations of I , since they all pass through a 1-vertex i . Therefore,

we have a tame hereditary subcategory \mathcal{C} of type $\widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_6$, given by vertices x, i, j, a, b, c, d and arrows $\alpha, \gamma, \delta, \delta^*, \nu$ and $\bar{\nu}$.

Now, it follows that both \bar{i} and i^* are 2-regular. To prove this, suppose one of them, say \bar{i} , is a 1-regular vertex. We claim that then both $\delta\bar{\gamma} \not\prec I$ and $\delta^*\bar{\gamma} \not\prec I$. Indeed, if one of the paths is involved in a minimal relation, then by Lemma 3.3, we obtain a triangle $\bullet \rightarrow x \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} \bar{i} \rightarrow \bullet$, where $\bullet = a$ or b , so a or b is a 2-vertex, due to Lemma 3.5 (a triangle with 1-vertex \bar{i}). But then there is an arrow $a \rightarrow a'$ different from δ or an arrow $b \rightarrow b'$ different from δ^* , which gives a wild hereditary subcategory of type $\widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_6$ (obtained from \mathcal{C} by adding the new arrow together with a vertex a' or b'). This shows that both $\delta\bar{\gamma} \not\prec I$ and $\delta^*\bar{\gamma} \not\prec I$, which yields another contradiction, since then we get a wild hereditary subcategory of type $\widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_4$, given as follows

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \bar{i} & & \\ & & \uparrow \bar{\gamma} & & \\ a & \xrightarrow{\delta} & x & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & i & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & j \\ & & \uparrow \delta^* & & \\ & & b & & \end{array}$$

As a result, it has been proved that \bar{i} is 2-regular, and hence we have an arrow $i' \rightarrow \bar{i}$ in Q . Using dual arguments, one can prove that i^* is 2-regular, so there is an arrow $i^* \rightarrow i''$. One can also assume that all a, b, c, d are 1-regular, since otherwise, as above \mathcal{C} can be extended to a wild hereditary subcategory of type $\widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_6$. So a, b, c, d are 1-vertices.

Moreover, using an analogous argument with $\widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_4$, we deduce that $\delta\bar{\gamma} \prec I$ or $\delta^*\bar{\gamma} \prec I$ and $\alpha^*\nu \prec I$ or $\alpha^*\bar{\nu} \prec I$. Actually, we may assume that all of the paths $\delta\bar{\gamma}, \delta^*\bar{\gamma}, \alpha^*\nu$ and $\alpha^*\bar{\nu}$ are involved in minimal relations. Indeed, if one of them, say $\delta\bar{\gamma} \not\prec I$, then $\delta^*\bar{\gamma} \prec I$ and we obtain the following subcategory

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} i' & \longrightarrow & \bar{i} & & & & \\ & & \nwarrow \bar{\gamma} & & a & & \\ & & & & \downarrow \delta & & \\ & & & & x & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & i & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & j & \xleftarrow{\alpha^*} & i^* & \longrightarrow & i'' \\ & & \nearrow \delta^* & & \uparrow b & & \end{array}$$

being a wild one-relation algebra RiVI.

Concluding, Q has a subquiver of the following form

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & a & & & & c \\ & & \uparrow \sigma & \searrow \delta & & & \uparrow \nu \\ i' & \longrightarrow & \bar{i} & \xleftarrow{\bar{\gamma}} & x & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & i & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & j & \xleftarrow{\alpha^*} & i^* & \longrightarrow & i'' \\ & & \downarrow \bar{\sigma} & \nearrow \delta^* & & & & & & & \downarrow \bar{\nu} & & \\ & & b & & & & & & & & d & & \end{array}$$

Now, applying Proposition 5.1 to a 1-vertex a in a triangle, we see that one of the successors of \bar{i} must be a 2-vertex, which gives a contradiction, since here both a, b are 1-regular. Therefore, it has been proven that $\{a, b\}$ and $\{c, d\}$ share at least one vertex. Without loss of generality, we assume that $a = c$.

(3) The next step is to show that then $b \neq d$: Assume that $b = d$. We will show that then one of a or b must be a 1-regular vertex, and then it would follow that i belongs to a block of type V2, as required. Suppose to the contrary that both a and b are 2-vertices. Then there are

arrows $\eta : y \rightarrow a, \eta' : a \rightarrow y'$ and $\sigma : z \rightarrow b, \sigma' : b \rightarrow z'$ with $\eta \neq \nu, \eta' \neq \delta, \sigma \neq \bar{\nu}$ and $\sigma' \neq \delta^*$. Now it is easy to see that one of the paths $\eta\delta, \nu\eta', \sigma\delta^*$ or $\bar{\nu}\sigma'$ is not involved in a minimal relation. Indeed, if all the paths are involved in minimal relations, then it follows from Lemma 3.3 that $y = z = \bar{i}$ ($i = y$ or z implies $j = a$ or b) and similarly $y' = z' = i^*$, and in this case Λ admits the following wild subcategory

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} i & \longleftarrow & x & \longleftarrow & a \\ & & \delta^* \uparrow & & \downarrow \eta' \\ & & b & \xrightarrow{\sigma'} & i^* \end{array}$$

Hence one of the paths, say $\eta\delta$, is not involved in a minimal relation of I . But then Λ admits another subcategory of the same shape:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} y & \xrightarrow{\eta} & a & \xleftarrow{\nu} & j \\ & & \delta \downarrow & & \downarrow \bar{\nu} \\ & & x & \xleftarrow{\delta^*} & b \end{array}$$

but not necessarily wild. Clearly, Λ is wild if both $\nu\delta \not\prec I$ and $\bar{\nu}\delta^* \not\prec I$. We shall show that this is the case. In fact, if $\nu\delta \prec I$, then by Lemma 3.3, there is an arrow $\bar{\gamma} = \alpha^* : x \rightarrow j$, and hence $j = \bar{i}$ and $x = i^*$. Further, we conclude from Lemmas 3.3 and 3.6 that $\bar{\nu}\sigma' \not\prec I$ and $\alpha\bar{\nu}\sigma' \not\prec I$, because $a \neq b$ and i is a 1-vertex not lying in a triangle. Using dual arguments, we see that also $\sigma\delta^* \not\prec I$ and $\sigma\delta^*\gamma \not\prec I$. In this case, we must have $\sigma\sigma' \prec I$, because otherwise we get the following wild subcategory of type $\tilde{\mathbb{D}}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & i & & z & & \\ & & \alpha \downarrow & & \sigma \downarrow & & \\ y & \xrightarrow{\eta} & a & \xleftarrow{\nu} & j & \xrightarrow{\bar{\nu}} & b & \xrightarrow{\sigma'} & z' \end{array}$$

As a result, vertices z and z' lie in one triangle, and hence, both cannot be 1-regular, by Lemma 3.5. Without loss of generality, let z be a 2-vertex. In a similar way, we can prove that $\eta\eta' \prec I$, so one of y or y' is a 2-vertex, and moreover, $\eta\delta\gamma \not\prec I$. If y is a 2-vertex then Λ admits the following subcategory

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \circ & \longleftarrow & z & & i & & \\ & & \searrow \sigma & & \uparrow \gamma & & \\ z' & \xleftarrow{\sigma'} & b & \xrightarrow{\delta^*} & x & \xleftarrow{\delta} & a & \xleftarrow{\eta} & y & \longrightarrow & \circ \end{array}$$

which is a wild one-relation algebra RiIX. If y' is a 2-vertex we replace $a \xleftarrow{\eta} y \longrightarrow \circ$ by $a \xrightarrow{\eta'} y' \longleftarrow \circ$, which gives a wild subcategory of the same type.

(4) Suppose $a = c$, but $b \neq d$. In this case, we conclude from Lemma 3.6 that $\delta^*\gamma\alpha \not\prec I$ and $\gamma\alpha\bar{\nu} \not\prec I$. We can also assume that $i^* \neq \bar{i}$, since for $i^* = \bar{i}$, we would get the following wild subcategory of Λ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & i & & \\ & & \gamma \nearrow & & \searrow \alpha \\ b & \xrightarrow{\delta^*} & x & \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} & i^* & \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} & j \end{array}$$

Note: $\bar{\gamma}\alpha^* \not\prec I$, because i is not a part of a triangle, and $\delta^*\bar{\gamma}\alpha^* \not\prec I$, again by Lemma 3.6, since we have no arrows $j \rightarrow b$. In particular, $i^* \neq \bar{i}$ implies also $\alpha^*\nu\delta \not\prec I$ and $\nu\delta\bar{\gamma} \not\prec I$.

(5) As the final part of the proof, we will show that a is a 1-vertex. Suppose to the contrary that a is a 2-vertex, we will consider two cases. Denote by η, η' the arrows $\eta : y \rightarrow a$ and $\eta' : a \rightarrow y'$.

We may assume further that $\nu\delta \not\prec I$. Indeed, if $\nu\delta \prec I$, then by Lemma 3.3, we get that there is an arrow $\bar{\gamma} = \alpha^* : x \rightarrow j$, so $i^* = x$ and $\bar{i} = j$, and Q has locally the following shape

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & i & & \\ & \nearrow \gamma & & \searrow \alpha & \\ b & \xrightarrow{\delta^*} & x & \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} & j \end{array}$$

The above subquiver gives rise to a wild subcategory, because we have no arrows $j \rightarrow b$, so both $\delta^*\gamma\alpha \not\prec I$ and $\delta^*\bar{\gamma} \not\prec I$, due to 3.6 and 3.3.

Case A. Suppose that $\alpha^*\bar{\nu} \not\prec I$.

Observe first that $\alpha^*\nu \prec I$, since otherwise Λ admits a wild subcategory of type $\widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_4$ formed by $\alpha, \alpha^*, \nu, \bar{\nu}$ and η . Moreover, if i^* is a 1-vertex, then due to Lemma 3.3, $\alpha^*\nu \prec I$ implies an arrow $a \rightarrow i^*$, so i^* is a 1-vertex in a triangle. But then, by Proposition 5.1, we have at least one 2-regular predecessor of j , which leads to a contradiction, since here j has two 1-regular predecessors: i and i^* . Hence we may assume that i^* is 2-regular. If also d is 2-regular, then Λ admits the following wild subcategory of type $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}_6$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & & \circ & & \\ & & & & \uparrow & & \\ & & & & i^* & & \\ & & & & \downarrow \alpha^* & & \\ \bar{i} & \xleftarrow{\bar{\gamma}} & x & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & i & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & j & \xrightarrow{\bar{\nu}} & d & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \circ \end{array}$$

From now on, let d be a 1-regular vertex and $\zeta : d \rightarrow d'$ be the unique arrow starting at d . Then d' is a 2-vertex, by Lemma 3.2, so we have another arrow $d'' \rightarrow d'$. Moreover, we have $\bar{\nu}\zeta \not\prec I$, since otherwise $d' = i^*$, and we get a triangle $(\alpha^* \bar{\nu} \zeta)$ satisfying $\alpha^*\bar{\nu} \not\prec I$ but $\bar{\nu}\zeta \prec I$. But this gives a contradiction with Lemma 3.4, because we have no double arrows from i^* to j . Note also that $\alpha\bar{\nu}\zeta \not\prec I$. In fact, if $\alpha\bar{\nu}\zeta \prec I$, we would get an arrow $d' \rightarrow i$, by Lemma 3.6, hence $d' = x$, and so $d = a$ or b , a contradiction. Now, if also $\alpha^*\bar{\nu}\zeta \not\prec I$, then Λ admits the following wild subcategory of type RiVIII

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \circ & \xleftarrow{\quad} & i^* & & i & & \\ & & \searrow \alpha^* & & \downarrow \alpha & & \\ \circ & \xrightarrow{\quad} & a & \xleftarrow{\nu} & j & \xrightarrow{\bar{\nu}} & d & \xrightarrow{\zeta} & d' & \xleftarrow{\quad} & d'' \end{array}$$

Finally, let $\alpha^*\bar{\nu}\zeta \prec I$. In this case, the vertex i^* is the target of two arrows $\omega : d' \rightarrow i^*$ and $\omega^* : a \rightarrow i^*$. Hence, we get a wild subcategory of type $\widetilde{\mathbb{D}}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} & & & & i & & & & d & & & & \\ & & & & \uparrow \gamma & & & & \downarrow \zeta & & & & \\ b & \xrightarrow{\delta^*} & x & \xleftarrow{\delta} & a & \xrightarrow{\omega^*} & i^* & \xleftarrow{\omega} & d' & \xrightarrow{\phi} & e & \xleftarrow{\psi} & e' \end{array}$$

if e is 2-regular. For e being 1-regular with $\psi : e \rightarrow e'$ a unique arrow starting at e , we get similar wild subcategory of type $\widetilde{\mathbb{D}}$, because both $\phi\psi \not\prec I$ and $\zeta\phi\psi \not\prec I$. Indeed $\phi\psi \prec I$, then we

get a triangle $d' \rightarrow e \rightarrow e' = d'' \rightarrow d'$ with a 1-vertex e . Hence, by Proposition 5.1, we conclude that there is an arrow $e' \rightarrow d$, so $e' = j$, since d is the unique 1-regular predecessor of d' . But then $e = i$, so $d' = x$, and we obtain that $d = a$ or b , a contradiction. Similarly, if $\zeta\phi\psi \prec I$, then Lemma 3.6 yields an arrow $e' \rightarrow d$, so again $e' = j$, and we are done in this case.

Using dual arguments, one can as above exclude case $\delta^*\bar{\gamma} \not\prec I$.

Case B. We are now left with the case when both $\alpha^*\bar{\nu} \prec I$ and $\delta^*\bar{\gamma} \prec I$. Then it follows from Lemma 3.3 that there are arrows $\mu : d \rightarrow i^*$ and $\mu' : \bar{i} \rightarrow b$.

Let first both $\nu\eta' \prec I$ and $\eta\delta \prec I$. Then $y' = i^*$ and $y = \bar{i}$, due to Lemma 3.3. Moreover, if $\eta\eta' \not\prec I$, then Λ admits the following subcategory

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & i & & & & \\ & & \uparrow \gamma & & & & \\ \circ & \longleftarrow & b & \xrightarrow{\delta^*} & x & \xleftarrow{\delta} & a & \xrightarrow{\eta'} & i^* & \xleftarrow{\mu} & d & \longrightarrow & \circ \\ & & & & & & & & \nearrow \xi & & & & \end{array}$$

where ξ is the second arrow starting at i^* (different from α^*). Note that $\eta'\xi \not\prec I$, because otherwise, we would get a triangle $(\eta' \xi \eta)$ with $\eta'\xi \prec I$, but $\eta\eta' \not\prec I$, which contradicts properties described in Lemma 3.4. Further, both b, d must be 2-regular, because otherwise by Proposition 5.1 (these vertices lie in triangles) we would obtain $j = \bar{i}$ or $i^* = x$, and then $b = a$ or $d = a$ or $d = b$, which is impossible. If $\mu\xi \not\prec I$, then this is already a wild subcategory of type $\tilde{\mathbb{D}}$. For $\mu\xi \prec I$, the vertex z is lying in a triangle, so it must be a 2-vertex by Proposition 5.1, because i^* does not have a 1-regular predecessor (a, d are 2-regular). Then the above subcategory can be extended using arrow $\circ \rightarrow z$ yielding a wild one-relation algebra RiXVIII.

Now, assume that $\eta\eta' \prec I$. Then, by 3.3, we have an arrow $\xi : i^* \rightarrow \bar{i}$. As in case $\eta\eta' \not\prec I$, we conclude from Proposition 5.1 that b and d are 2-regular vertices. Moreover, also \bar{i}, i^* are 2-vertices, because we have the two arrows $\bar{\gamma}, \xi$ ending at \bar{i} and the two arrows α^*, ξ starting at i^* (Q is regular). Let $\sigma : d' \rightarrow d$ be the second arrow $\sigma \neq \bar{\nu}$ ending at d and $\beta : b' \rightarrow b$ the second arrow $\beta \neq \mu'$ ending at b . If d' is a 2-vertex, then we can find the following wild hereditary subcategory in covering:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} & & & & i & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & \downarrow \alpha & & & & & & & & \\ b' & \xrightarrow{\beta} & b & \xleftarrow{\mu'} & \bar{i} = y & \xrightarrow{\eta} & a & \xleftarrow{\nu} & j & \xrightarrow{\bar{\nu}} & d & \xleftarrow{\sigma} & d' & \longrightarrow & \circ \end{array}$$

Hence we may assume that d' is 1-regular. Denote by $\sigma' : d'' \rightarrow d'$ the unique arrow ending at d' . Then $\sigma'\sigma \prec I$, since otherwise, we could construct a wild hereditary subcategory of the same type as above (replacing the arrow $d' \rightarrow \circ$ by the arrow $\sigma' : d'' \rightarrow d'$). Consequently, d' must be a 1-vertex in a triangle $d'' \rightarrow d' \rightarrow d \rightarrow d''$, hence it follows from Proposition 5.1 that d admits a 1-regular successor different from d'' . But the second successor of d is $t(\mu) = i^*$, which is 2-regular, and we obtain a contradiction.

Finally, it remains to consider the case when $\nu\eta' \not\prec I$ or $\eta\delta \not\prec I$. Since the arguments are dual, we will proceed only in case $\nu\eta' \not\prec I$. As before, we can see that b and d are 2-regular vertices.

But then, using that also $\nu\delta \not\prec I$, we obtain the following wild subcategory:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & d & & \\
 & & & & \uparrow \bar{\nu} & & \\
 & & & & j & & \\
 & & & & \downarrow \nu & & \\
 \circ & \longleftarrow & b & \xrightarrow{\delta^*} & x & \xleftarrow{\delta} & a & \xrightarrow{\eta'} & y' & \xrightarrow{\phi} & e
 \end{array}$$

Indeed, if y' is a 2-vertex, then we take an arrow $\phi : e \rightarrow y' \neq \eta'$. Now, it is sufficient to see that for y' being a 1-vertex, we can take ϕ as the unique arrow $y' \rightarrow e$. To see this, we have to prove that $\eta'\phi \not\prec I$ and $\nu\eta'\phi \not\prec I$.

By Lemma 3.3, $\eta'\phi \prec I$ gives a triangle $a \rightarrow y' \rightarrow e \rightarrow a$, where y' is a 1-vertex. Then $e = y$ must be a 2-vertex, due to Lemma 3.5. But now, applying Proposition 5.1 to this triangle, we conclude that a must have at least one 1-regular predecessor, which is impossible, since a has only 2-regular predecessors, namely: $e = y$ and j .

Finally, if $\nu\eta'\phi \prec I$, then by Lemma 3.6, we have an arrow $e \rightarrow j$, so $e = i^*$, because e is cannot be a 1-vertex. This means we have an arrow $y' \rightarrow i^*$, hence i^* is a 2-vertex in Q . Take the second arrow $\psi \neq \alpha^*$, $\psi : i^* \rightarrow z$, starting at i^* . Further, $\alpha^*\nu \not\prec I$, because otherwise, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that there is an arrow $a = c \rightarrow i^*$, and we obtain $a = d$ or $a = y'$, which is a contradiction. When z is a 1-vertex with the unique arrow $\psi' : z \rightarrow z'$ starting at z , then z' is 2-regular, due to Lemma 3.2. Moreover, then $\psi\psi' \not\prec I$, since for $\psi\psi' \prec I$, we would obtain a triangle with vertices $i^*, z, z' = d$ (by 3.3) with 1-regular vertex z , and then Proposition 5.1 implies that i^* has a 1-regular predecessor y' being a target of arrow starting at d , and hence $a = d$, because $\eta' : a \rightarrow y'$ is the unique arrow ending at 1-regular vertex y' . Consequently, in case z is 1-regular, we get the following subcategory

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & i & & i^* & \xrightarrow{\psi} & z & \xrightarrow{\psi'} & z' & \xleftarrow{\xi} & z'' \\
 & & \downarrow \alpha & \nearrow \alpha^* & & & & & & & \\
 & & j & & & & & & & & \\
 y & \xrightarrow{\eta} & a & \xleftarrow{\nu} & j & \xrightarrow{\bar{\nu}} & d & \longleftarrow & d'
 \end{array}$$

which is isomorphic to a wild one-relation algebra RiXIII. For z being a 2-vertex, we obtain a wild subcategory of the same type, but with arrows

$$z \xleftarrow{\psi^*} z' \xrightarrow{\xi} z''$$

instead of $z \xrightarrow{\psi'} z' \xleftarrow{\xi} z''$. Indeed, z is 2-regular, so we can take the second arrow $\psi^* : z' \rightarrow z$ ending at z , which is different from ψ . Then it is sufficient to see that z' is 2-regular, and we will conclude existence of the second arrow $\xi : z' \rightarrow z''$, $\xi \neq \psi^*$. So suppose to the contrary that z' is 1-regular with the unique arrow ending at z' denoted by $\xi : z'' \rightarrow z'$. In this case, we would obtain the same wild subcategory as above if $\xi\psi^* \not\prec I$, so we can assume that $\xi\psi^* \prec I$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.3, we conclude that there is an arrow $z \rightarrow z''$ and vertices z'', z', z lie on a triangle with 1-vertex z' . As a result, using Proposition 5.1 again, we infer that there is also an arrow $z'' \rightarrow i^*$, and then $z'' = d$ or $z'' = y'$. Because Lemma 3.2 implies that z'' is 2-regular, we can have only $z'' = d$. Once again, by Proposition 5.1, we conclude that d must have at least one 1-regular predecessor, which is impossible, since d has only 2-regular predecessors j and $z \neq j$.

REFERENCES

- [1] I. Assem, D. Simson, A. Skowroński, Elements of the Representation Theory of Associative Algebras 1: Techniques of Representation Theory, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, vol. 65, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- [2] *J. Białkowski, K. Erdmann, A. Hajduk, A. Skowroński, K. Yamagata*, Socle equivalences of weighted surface algebras, *J. Pure and Appl. Algebra* 226 (2022) 106886.
- [3] *J. Białkowski, K. Erdmann, A. Skowroński*, Periodicity of self-injective algebras of polynomial growth, *J. Algebra* 443 (2015), 200–269.
- [4] *W. Crawley-Boevey*, On tame algebras and bocses, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **56** (1988), 451–483.
- [5] *P. Dowbor, A. Skowroński*, On Galois coverings of tame algebras, *Arch. Math. (Basel)* 44 (1985), 522–529.
- [6] *P. Dowbor, A. Skowroński*, On the representation type of locally bounded categories, *Tsukuba J. Math.* 10 (1986), 63–72.
- [7] *Y.A. Drozd*, Tame and wild matrix problems, in: Representation Theory II, in: Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 832, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, 1980, pp. 242–258.
- [8] *A. Dugas*, Periodic algebras and self-injective algebras of finite type, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 214 (2010), 990–1000.
- [9] *K. Erdmann*, On the number of simple modules of certain tame blocks and algebras, *Arch. Math. (Basel)* 51 (1988), 34–38.
- [10] *K. Erdmann*, Algebras and quaternion defect groups I, *Math. Ann.* 281 (1988), 545–560.
- [11] *K. Erdmann*, Algebras and quaternion defect groups II, *Math. Ann.* 281 (1988), 561–582.
- [12] *K. Erdmann*, Blocks of tame representation type and related algebras, *Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **1428** (1990).
- [13] *K. Erdmann*, A note on representation-finite symmetric algebras, arXiv:2304.11877v1.
- [14] *K. Erdmann, A. Hajduk, A. Skowroński*, Tame symmetric algebras of period four, *Arch. Math.* 122 (2024), 249–264.
- [15] *K. Erdmann, A. Skowroński*, Weighted surface algebras, *J. Algebra* **505** (2018), 490–558.
- [16] *K. Erdmann, A. Skowroński*, Algebras of generalized quaternion type, *Adv. Math.* **349** (2019), 1036–1116.
- [17] *K. Erdmann, A. Skowroński*, Weighted surface algebras: general version, *J. Algebra* **544** (2020), 170–227.
- [18] *K. Erdmann, A. Skowroński*, Higher tetrahedral algebras, *Algebras and Representation Theory*, **22**(2019), no. 2, 387–406.
- [19] *K. Erdmann, A. Skowroński*, Higher spherical algebras, *Archiv Math.* **114** (2020), 25–39.
- [20] *K. Erdmann, A. Skowroński*, Periodic algebras, in: Trends in Representation Theory of Algebras and Related Topics, in: Europ. Math. Soc. Series Congress Reports, European Math. Soc., Zürich, 2008, pp. 201–251.
- [21] *K. Erdmann, A. Skowroński*, The periodicity conjecture for blocks of group algebras, *Colloq. Math.* 138 (2015), 283–294.
- [22] *K. Erdmann, A. Skowroński*, From Brauer graph algebras to biserial weighted surface algebras, *J. Algebraic Combinatorics* **51** (2020), 51–88.
- [23] *K. Erdmann, A. Skowroński*, Weighted surface algebras: general version, Corrigendum, *J. Algebra* **569** (2021), 875–889.
- [24] *E. L. Green, N. Snashall, ?? Solberg*, The Hochschild cohomology ring of a selfinjective algebra of finite representation type. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 131 (2003), No. 11, 3387–3393.
- [25] *T. Holm*, Derived equivalent tame blocks, *J. Algebra* **194**(1997), 178–200.

- [26] *T. Holm*, Blocks of tame representation type and related algebras: Derived equivalence and Hochschild cohomology, Habilitationsschrift, 2001.
- [27] *T. Holm, A. Skowroński, A. Skowyrski*, Virtual mutations of weighted surface algebras, *J. Algebra* 619 (2023), 822–859.
- [28] *C. M. Ringel*, Tame algebras, preprint.
- [29] *A. Skowroński*, Selfinjective algebras: finite and tame type, *Contemp. Math.* **406**(2006), 169–238.
- [30] *A. Skowyrski*, Two tilts of higher spherical algebras, *Algebr. Represent. Theory* 25 (2021) 237–254.
- [31] *A. Skowyrski, A. Skowroński*, Generalized weighted surface algebras, arXiv:2106.15218
- [32] *A. Skowroński, K. Yamagata*, Frobenius algebras. I. Basic representation theory, EMS Textbooks in Mathematics, European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2011. xii+650 pp.

(Karin Erdmann) MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, UK

Email address: `erdmann@maths.ox.ac.uk`

(Adam Hajduk) FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, NICOLAUS COPERNICUS UNIVERSITY, CHOPINA 12/18, 87-100 TORUN, POLAND

Email address: `ahajduk@mat.umk.pl`

(Adam Skowyrski) FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, NICOLAUS COPERNICUS UNIVERSITY, CHOPINA 12/18, 87-100 TORUN, POLAND

Email address: `skowyr@mat.umk.pl`